

Desirous of reaffirming their adherence to the policy of submitting to impartial decision all justiciable controversies that may arise between the two countries; and

Eager by their example not only to demonstrate their condemnation of war as an instrument of national policy in their mutual relations, but also to hasten the time when the perfection of international arrangements for the pacific settlement of international disputes shall have eliminated forever the possibility of war among any of the Powers of the world;

Have decided to conclude a new treaty of arbitration enlarging the scope and obligations of the arbitration convention signed at Washington on May 18, 1908, which expired by limitation on March 29, 1914, and for that purpose they have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries

The President of the United States of America: Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State of the United States; and

His Majesty the King of Iceland and Denmark: Mr. Constantin Brun, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Washington;

Who, having communicated to one another their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I

All differences relating to international matters in which the High Contracting Parties are concerned by virtue of a claim of right made by one against the other under treaty or otherwise, which it has not been possible to adjust by diplomacy, which have not been adjusted as a result of reference to the Permanent International Commission constituted pursuant to the treaty signed at Washington April 17, 1914, and which are justiciable in their nature by reason of being susceptible of decision by the application of the principles of law or equity, shall be submitted to the Permanent Court of Arbitration established at The Hague by the Convention of October 18, 1907, or to some other competent tribunal, as shall be decided in each case by special agreement, which special agreement shall provide for the organization of such tribunal if necessary, define its powers, state the question or questions at issue, and settle the terms of reference.

The special agreement in each case shall be made on the part of the United States of America by the President of the United States of America by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and on the part of Iceland in accordance with its constitutional laws.

ARTICLE II

The provisions of this treaty shall not be invoked in respect of any dispute the subject matter of which

(a) is within the domestic jurisdiction of either of the High Contracting Parties,

(b) involves the interests of third Parties,

(c) depends upon or involves the maintenance of the traditional attitude of the United States concerning American questions, commonly described as the Monroe Doctrine,

(d) depends upon or involves the observance by Iceland, in the event that Iceland becomes a Party to the Covenant of the League of Nations, of its obligations in accordance with the Covenant.

ARTICLE III

The present treaty shall be ratified. The ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible, and the treaty shall take effect on the date of the exchange of the ratifications. It shall thereafter remain in force continuously unless and until terminated by one year's written notice given by either High Contracting Party to the other.

In faith whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty in duplicate in the English language and hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at Washington the 15th day of May, one thousand nine hundred and thirty.

For the United States of America:

[SEAL]

HENRY L. STIMSON

For Iceland:

[SEAL]

C. BRUN.

Mr. BORAH. This is the ordinary arbitration treaty.

The treaty was reported to the Senate without amendment, and the resolution of ratification was read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive J, 71st, 2nd, an arbitration treaty with Iceland signed at Washington on May 15, 1930.

The resolution was agreed to, two-thirds of the Senators present voting in the affirmative.

HANFORD MACNIDER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hanford MacNider, of Iowa, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, Canada.

Mr. BORAH. At the request of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. STECK], in a letter which I have in my desk, the nomination may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

EDWARD T. FRANKS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward T. Franks to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

MISS BESS GOODYKOONTZ

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Miss Bess Goodykoontz, of Iowa, to be Assistant Commissioner of Education.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. PHIPPS. I ask that the postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified.

THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, my colleague earlier in the day reported the nomination of Charles E. Allen to be United States marshal for the western district of Washington, and I ask that the nomination be acted upon at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified. The Senate resumes legislative session.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNARY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 17, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 16, 1930

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Charles E. Allen, western district of Washington.

MEMBER FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Edward T. Franks.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Miss Bess Goodykoontz.

POSTMASTERS

MISSOURI

Fred M. Meinert, O'Fallon.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jennie Larkins, Ford City.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Samuel G. Mortimer, Belle Fourche.

VIRGINIA

David A. Sergeant, Big Stone Gap.

WASHINGTON

William C. Black, Lowell.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, June 16, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we wait a moment to acknowledge Thee as God over all. We desire to thank Thee for looking down from Thy sovereign throne, concerned for our welfare. We would take heed to ourselves and to Thy law. We are grateful to Thee that we are not solitary and alone. In the hour of temptation, in the stern discharge of duty, and when the burdens bend low Thou art our Father, touched with a feeling of our infirmity.

Thou art the blessed guaranty of our security here and forever. We praise Thee for the eye that is fixed on earth's multitudes, for the arm that upholds the skies, for the ear that is filled with the angels' songs, and for the abiding love that is enthroned for ever and ever. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 14, 1930, was read and approved.

PRIZE FIGHTING AND BOXING, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Consent Calendar.

The first business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9182) to prevent professional prize fighting and to authorize amateur boxing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has anything specific to suggest with reference to an amendment?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman that I have turned over certain amendments to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS]. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to pass over this bill temporarily without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL PROHIBITION ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11199) to amend sections 22 and 39, Title II, of the national prohibition act.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

TITLE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN MINNESOTA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5178) ratifying and confirming the title of the State of Minnesota and its grantees to certain lands patented to it by the United States of America.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, since this bill was passed over the last time it was up, I have had further time to examine it. I have gone over it with the officials of the Interior Department as well as with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SELVIG]. I have a statement from the gentleman from Minnesota, which I will ask unanimous consent to make part of my remarks. I ask unanimous consent to extend as part of my remarks on this bill a letter from the gentleman from Minnesota, and in view of that letter I shall not press any objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan to extend his remarks in the manner indicated?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. The letter is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1930.

Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CRAMTON: The item of \$125,000 for timber cut on lands claimed by Minnesota was asserted by the State in the pending suit not as a counterclaim for which affirmative recovery was sought, but merely as a set-off against any amount that might be recovered by the Federal Government from the State. The disposal of the pending suit merely leaves the matter in statu quo.

The claim has existed for many years. No statute exists under which Minnesota could bring suit against the United States. Only Congress can act upon it.

As far as I can learn, there is no disposition on the part of Minnesota's present administration to seek any relief from Congress, and in view of the fact that the claim is now a stale one, I have no reason to believe that such relief will be sought in the future.

Yours very truly,

C. G. SELVIG.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. SELVIG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill S. 4283 for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 4283

A bill ratifying and confirming the title of the State of Minnesota and its grantees to certain lands patented to it by the United States of America

Be it enacted, etc., That the title of the State of Minnesota and its grantees and assigns be, and the same hereby is, ratified and confirmed in respect of all lands included within the following-described patents issued by the United States of America to the State of Minnesota, to wit: Patent No. 1, dated May 14, 1877; patent No. 3, dated August 5, 1880; patent No. 4, dated November 20, 1880; patent No. 5, dated April 13, 1881; patent No. 6, dated March 27, 1885; patent No. 7, dated March 10, 1888; patent No. 28, dated September 20, 1893; patent No. 41, dated March 15, 1895; patent No. 59, dated April 30, 1896; patent No. 65, dated September 15, 1896; patent No. 72, dated January 18, 1897; patent No. 73, dated February 11, 1897; patent No. 77, dated May 6, 1897; patent No. 82, dated October 20, 1897; patent No. 84, dated January 15, 1898; patent No. 92, dated February 21, 1899; patent No. 95, dated March 15, 1899; patent No. 106, dated October 23, 1899; patent No. 110, dated April 20, 1900; patent No. 126, dated August 26, 1901; patent No. 127, dated August 28, 1901; patent No. 139, dated August 17, 1903; patent No. 163, dated October 14, 1904; patent No. 167, dated January 12, 1905; patent No. 169, dated March 27, 1905; patent No. 170, dated April 8, 1905; patent No. 174, dated October 17, 1905; patent No. 176, dated November 23, 1905.

Sec. 2. This act shall take effect and be of force only when and after the State of Minnesota shall by legislative act have waived and relinquished any and all right and claim that it may by virtue of the provisions of the act of Congress of March 12, 1860 (12 Stat. L. 3), have in or to swamp and overflowed lands lying within the White Earth Indian Reservation in Minnesota which have heretofore been conveyed by the United States by patent in trust or in fee to any Indian whether of full blood or of mixed blood.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate bill was passed was laid on the table.

CHIPPEWA INDIANS IN WISCONSIN

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10932) for the relief of homeless and destitute Chippewa Indians in Forest, Langlade, and Oneida Counties, Wis.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I took this matter up with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and called his attention to the fact that there have been several investigations of these particular 141 Indians. Apparently they are destitute, and the commissioner informs me that he will detail an inspector this summer and obtain this information without the necessity of passing the bill. There is no need, therefore, for the passage of the bill, inasmuch as the end will be accomplished. Therefore I object, because I have that assurance from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

WALKER RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5057) to provide for the construction of a gravel road in the Walker River Indian Reservation.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

ALASKA GAME LAW

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11285) to amend the Alaska game law.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, I think we should have some information on this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill should be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have studied the bill since the gentleman made his observations before, and the particular points to which he objected are in the law now.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have not studied it anew, and in view of the statement of the gentleman from New York I will study it anew, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CLASSIFICATION AND PAY OF CLERKS IN IMMIGRATION SERVICE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10881) to amend section 24 of the immigration act of 1917, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what this bill really means.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. This bill was reported by the Immigration Committee. I think that report was made at the time the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] was a member of the committee. It provides for an increase in the salaries of clerks in the Immigration Service. It puts them on the same basis as clerks in the Customs Service. At the present time, as the gentleman knows, there is great disparity between these two classes of clerks, and both do the same type of work, exactly. This bill provides a system of increases for them, just as the bill that was passed two years ago, which provided for an increase in the salaries of inspectors. I think the gentleman from Illinois was very much in favor of the bill at that time.

Mr. SABATH. This will increase the salaries of the office force?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; the clerks. The increase is very insignificant. It classifies them and places them under a system of promotion just like the bill relating to inspectors. This bill has been very much sought after for a great many years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I served at Ellis Island 22 or 23 years ago, and the system of promotions for clerks at Ellis Island is in a most deplorable situation. I think this classification would give them at least a ray of hope. I think the bill should be passed.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman state what will be the approximate increases?

Mr. JENKINS. It has been estimated that the total increase would not exceed \$60,000 a year. There are 585 clerks.

Mr. SABATH. I think that is reasonable, and I will not object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in going over this bill I find that the Immigration Service is attempting to give to its clerks a preferential grade in the salaries that are to be paid to their field clerks, in contradiction to the salaries paid to the field clerks in the Customs Service. There is rivalry between the respective services. Clerks in the Customs Service to-day, I believe, receive a maximum salary of \$2,100.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I will say that the object of this bill is to bring about parity. There is no intention to work a rivalry or surpass anybody anywhere.

Mr. STAFFORD. The report shows that under the act—

Mr. HOWARD. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STAFFORD. The regular order has been demanded, and I will ask that this bill be passed over.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman from Nebraska withhold that for a moment?

Mr. HOWARD. Very well.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the report, at the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3, the salaries of clerks in the Customs Service, as provided by the act of May 29, 1928, stop at \$2,100. By this bill it is attempted to advance the salaries from \$1,600 to \$2,300. The salaries are raised \$200 more. The same applies again in class B, where they are to be boosted to \$2,500. I really think there should be some uniformity in the salaries paid to our field service irrespective of the service, but this is no

way to go about it—each department vying with the other to try to raise the salaries of their respective departments.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Two years ago this same proposition was advanced in connection with the inspectors. Everybody knows that when Mr. Coolidge was President economy was his watchword. This bill was passed providing for an increase of salaries for the inspectors. As I said, the increase is inconsequential. The system of promotion is the important thing. In spite of the fact that the Bureau of the Budget at that time found it inconvenient to recommend that inspectors' bill, President Coolidge did take it upon himself to take an interest in it, at my insistence and the insistence of the chairman, Mr. JOHNSON, and that he did approve of that bill and sign it. It has worked wonders, and the Department of Labor has gone on record in recommending this system. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that there is absolutely no intention to work a disparity.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have this bill passed over without prejudice, because a disparity could be provided, as evidenced by the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTRA COMPENSATION, EMPLOYEES OF IMMIGRATION SERVICE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3309) to provide extra compensation for overtime service performed by immigrant inspectors and other employees of the Immigration Service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman will permit, if this goes over without prejudice at this time, in all likelihood it will not receive action at this session of Congress.

Let me point out from my own experience that very often, for the accommodation of the steamship companies and not for the accommodation of the Government, a ship is passed quarantine just in time. It comes to the harbor, and the immigration officers are required to work late hours. I have seen instances myself where the immigration officers were working at the same time with the customs officials, and the customs officials received payment for overtime, this payment being direct from the steamship company but through the Government.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is so far-reaching that I feel it should not be here without a definite departmental report and due consideration by hearings in committee and otherwise of the various angles. For instance, this not only applies to an ocean liner in such emergencies as my friend from New York spoke of, but it applies to every international ferry and every international bridge. I have not had an opportunity to go into it at any length. It is a matter that should be gone into at length in committee. I have been told, for instance, that at international bridges there is great strife among the employees to get on the overtime shift; that for eight hours which they spend in overtime, or on the night shift, they will get three days' pay, two from the bridge company and one from the Government.

It is not an emergency, but it is a regular thing. The bridge is open every night; it is known it will be, and the fellow who gets a night shift receives three days' pay for eight hours' work. There are two things to be considered. First, whether they are entitled to that compensation; and, second, if they are, whether it ought to be paid out of the Treasury or whether it should be paid by the bridge owners. There is some question as to whether we have an equitable right to impose that heavy burden of \$50,000 or \$100,000 a year on an international bridge. I think it ought to be gone into carefully.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. I will say to the gentleman that this bill has been given great consideration by the Committee on Immigration in previous years.

Mr. CRAMTON. Have there been any hearings?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; in previous years.

Mr. CRAMTON. How long ago?

Mr. JENKINS. Two years ago, when we had up this other proposition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Were people interested in these carriers and in these bridges given a chance to be heard?

Mr. JENKINS. They were given a chance to be heard, but whether they were actually heard or not I do not know. However, I can say this to the gentleman: This bill does not carry a single departure over the customs law. It is identical with the customs law.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, there is quite a question about the customs situation, whether that is the way it ought to be or not.

Mr. JENKINS. That is true, and because of that it is thought wise to insert an amendment in this bill restricting and controlling immigration across the international bridges. I have such an amendment prepared, and if that is the only objection the gentleman has I will be glad to introduce the amendment, because I think it will clarify the whole situation.

Mr. GREENWOOD. If the gentleman will permit, the shipping interests do not have to accept this overtime service unless they desire to do so.

Mr. CRAMTON. But what is a bridge going to do?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I am speaking of the shipping interests. The suggestion is made that it applies to bridges, and if that is true they can be taken care of by the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Ohio. However, if the shipping interests desire this overtime service they can ask for it, and if they ask for it they pay for it.

Mr. CRAMTON. What about these international ferries? They run regularly; it is not an emergency but it is a regular thing.

Mr. GREENWOOD. The point I am making is that these interests do not have to accept the service unless they want it. If they petition for it, then it will be given to them and they will pay for the service.

Mr. CRAMTON. At Port Huron, Mich., there is a ferry running across a river of about 1,500 feet in width. The ferry is rendering an important public service and under this bill they would have to give this overtime service or else deny service to the public.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If the gentleman will permit, where there is a permanent ferry it can work on schedule, and the gentleman from Ohio has an amendment ready which will cover the situation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Which will take care of ferries running on regular schedules?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The bill as it stands does not provide that.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I think the bill should be amended, but the point I am making is that if these interests desire this service they can ask for it and then they pay for it and not the Treasury.

Mr. STAFFORD. As the gentleman from Ohio well knows, I requested on the last call that this bill be passed over without prejudice. I notice the gentleman is all pervasive in his attempt to extend the scope of the bill. I am unwilling, from my acquaintance with transportation problems, to have this extra compensation applied to extra services rendered on trains, airplanes, or other vehicles. I am strongly opposed to that, because that would cover the case of the Peace Bridge at Buffalo, the Ambassador Bridge at Detroit, and every other bridge across the international border. On those bridges the men are working on regular time and should not be given two and a half times overtime at the expense of the bridge companies.

Mr. JENKINS. The amendment I propose will cover that.

Mr. STAFFORD. The amendment which the gentleman proposes does not make that plain.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me ask the gentleman just what his amendment means. The amendment reads:

Provided, however, That the provisions of this act relating to extra compensation shall not apply to international bridges, or to ferries and railroad trains operating on regular schedules.

To that point the amendment is definite, but it proceeds:

But nothing contained in this provision shall be construed in any manner to affect or alter the length of a working day for immigration employees or the overtime pay herein fixed.

Mr. JENKINS. I can explain that to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. That seems to put back that which you have eliminated.

Mr. JENKINS. I will explain what that is. These international trains run on regular schedules. Sometimes they want to run excursions or want to run two or three sections of a train, and, especially if they want to run an excursion, their policy is to ask the immigration inspector to go up into Canada and meet the train about fifty or a hundred miles away and work the train as it comes down. If they want to run these extra trains and want extra service, they ought to pay for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is unacquainted with the conditions between the United States and Canada on the regular trains of the Michigan Central.

Mr. JENKINS. If the gentleman wants to strike that out, I am willing.

Mr. CRAMTON. I very much fear the last three lines of the language entirely nullify the first five lines. If the gentleman is willing to eliminate the last three lines, I withdraw any objection.

Mr. JENKINS. I am willing to do that. I raised the same question that the gentleman has raised here, and it was explained to me just as I have stated here.

Mr. CRAMTON. Perhaps, I could see it in the same way if I had longer time to consider it.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Let us have the amendment read now, as modified.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to say that unless amendment No. 1, suggested by the gentleman from Ohio, a copy of which he did me the courtesy of submitting, and amendment No. 2, with an amendment I wish to suggest, are adopted I shall object. The amendment I intend to suggest to the gentleman's amendment No. 2 is "on the land and water border of the United States where 18 hours' or more inspection service is maintained." This is to take care of the conditions at the ferry at Detroit with which I am cognizant.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman repeat his proposed amendments.

Mr. STAFFORD. These are not my amendments. They are amendments submitted to me by the courtesy of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUDSON. I trust the gentleman will accept the offer of the gentleman from Ohio and withhold any objections. I know something of the conditions involved here.

Mr. STAFFORD. I intend to withhold any objection upon the condition that the amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio are incorporated in the bill to meet conditions which I think are exigent.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. May we have stated the gentleman's proposed amendments?

Mr. STAFFORD. These are not my amendments. They are amendments proposed to be offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUDSON. The gentleman has stated he expects to offer the amendments.

Mr. CRAMTON. As I understand, they are alternate propositions.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; to my mind they are supplementary.

Mr. JENKINS. They are not altogether in the alternative, but it seems to me that either one of the three would answer.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think all three are necessary to meet my objections.

Mr. JENKINS. I will say to the gentleman that our object is to meet the emergency which exists, and I shall be pleased to accept any reasonable amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Amendment No. 2, suggested by the gentleman, provides in line 7, page 2, after the word "duty," insert "Provided, That at those posts on the land border of the United States where 24-hour inspection service is maintained, no overtime shall be charged." I wish to have this read "on the land-and-water border of the United States where 18 hours' or more inspection service is maintained."

Mr. JENKINS. I will accept that.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the purpose of the 18-hour provision is to provide for the ferry between Windsor and Detroit, with which I am familiar.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Then the purpose of the gentleman's amendment is to cover cases where there is continuous and regular 18-hour ferry service?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is it exactly; or bridge service.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It would not apply to ocean steamers?

Mr. STAFFORD. No. I wish this law to apply to ocean steamers, and I want to limit it to ocean traffic conditions.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me ask my friend from Wisconsin a question. If we have an amendment that the provisions of this act relating to extra compensation shall not apply to international bridges or to ferries or railroad trains operating on regular schedules, it would seem to me that would reach the whole thing.

Mr. JENKINS. I think that would meet the gentleman's objection, but I do not, of course, want to supplant his judgment with mine or to interpret what he has in mind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not only the railroad train crossing the border is concerned but any regular established service across the border, and these men should not be privileged to exact two and a half times their salary for just an hour's additional work. It is only intended to apply to ocean service, and that is the main consideration.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman again suggest his amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. First, I accept the gentleman's amendment No. 1, which the gentleman suggested to me.

Mr. SABATH. What is that amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. Insert in line 7, page 2, after the word "duty," the following:

In those ports where the customary working hours are other than those heretofore mentioned, the Secretary of Labor is vested with authority to regulate the hours of immigration employees so as to agree with the prevailing working hours in said ports, but nothing contained in this section shall be construed in any manner to affect or alter the length of a working day for immigration employees or the overtime pay herein fixed.

Many of these amendments, I will say, that were suggested by the gentleman from Ohio, are parts of the law applying to the Customs Service.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; exactly.

Mr. SABATH. That was the intention, I understand.

Mr. STAFFORD. Amendment No. 2 I have already referred to. It should apply not only to the land but the water border, where 18 hours or more service is maintained.

Then, here are some amendments I suggest, which I think are fundamental, and I would like to have the attention of the gentleman.

In line 10, page 1, strike out "trains, airplanes, or other vehicles."

I want this limited to steamships.

Mr. JENKINS. How about the border?

Mr. STAFFORD. There are no exigent conditions about the border. There is no trouble on the Michigan Central with the regular employments. I have traveled on that line time and time again.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I see that we are quite in harmony as to views, but I am not at all certain, if we accept amendment No. 3—

Mr. STAFFORD. The others are part of the present law, which I examined yesterday.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not sure but what then No. 2, which my friend from Wisconsin has in mind, applying only to other posts than ferries and trains, might be held to apply to ferries and trains, and might complicate the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There are so few of them that they get caught in work at all hours.

Mr. STAFFORD. These three amendments are taken more or less from the law applicable to the Customs Service.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say this: That I have no disposition to stand in the way. Gentlemen have expressed their willingness to accomplish the things I have referred to. It is difficult to be sure what the language will do, but I am willing to let the bill go through with the amendments as agreed upon, and if it proves necessary to make some change to accomplish what we have agreed upon I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no objection with the understanding that the amendments I have referred to are agreed to.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Labor shall fix a reasonable rate of extra compensation for overtime services of inspectors and employees of the Immigration Service who may be required to remain on duty between the hours of 5 o'clock postmeridian and 8 o'clock antemeridian, or on Sundays or holidays, to perform duties in connection with the examination and landing of passengers and crews of steamships, trains, airplanes, or other vehicles arriving in the United States from a foreign port by water, land, or air, such rates to be fixed on a basis of one-half day's additional pay for each two hours or fraction thereof of at least one hour that the overtime extends beyond 5 o'clock postmeridian (but not to exceed two and one-half days' pay for the full period from 5 o'clock postmeridian to 8 o'clock antemeridian) and two additional days' pay for Sunday and holiday duty.

SEC. 2. The said extra compensation shall be paid by the master, owner, agent, or consignee of such vessel or other conveyance arriving in the United States from a foreign port to the Secretary of Labor, who shall pay the same to the several immigration officers and employees entitled thereto as provided in this act. "Such extra compensation shall be paid if such officers or employees have been ordered to report for duty and have so reported, whether the actual inspection or examination of passengers or crew takes place or not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out the words "trains, airplanes, or other vehicles."

Line 1, page 2, strike out the words "land, or air."

On page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "or other conveyance."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if the purpose of the gentleman's amendment is to eliminate the extra time, particularly on the border, where the regular schedule is in operation?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the purpose.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is nothing in the amendment which in any way changes the purpose of the bill in its application to general steamship lines?

Mr. STAFFORD. No.

Mr. BRIGGS. These amendments will allow the immigration officers where they are serving overtime to accommodate the steamers to receive overtime pay.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; and to eliminate the land-and-air service.

Mr. BRIGGS. I understand the steamships pay for the extra service, and so there is no charge against the Government.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he thinks these other amendments are necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think they are.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7, on page 2, after the word "duty," strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "In those ports where the customary working hours are other than those heretofore mentioned, the Secretary of Labor is vested with authority to regulate the hours of immigration employees so as to agree with the prevailing working hours in said ports, but nothing contained in this section shall be construed in any manner to affect or alter the length of a working day for immigration employees or the overtime pay herein fixed."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7, on page 2, after the word "duty," strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "Provided, That at those posts on the land and water border of the United States where 18 hours or more inspection service is maintained no overtime shall be charged."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENKINS. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7, on page 2, after the word "duty," strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "Provided further, That the provisions of this act relating to extra compensation shall not apply to international bridges or to ferries and railroad trains operating on regular schedules."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORMER SENATOR CHARLES S. THOMAS ON OUR PUBLIC DOMAIN POLICY

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the public-land policy of the country, and to include therein a brief statement from former Senator Thomas, of Colorado.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter and statement by Hon. Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado, upon the past and present status of the public domain in the 11 Western States, and our future national policy in relation thereto.

Senator Thomas was formerly governor of our State and was twice elected to the United States Senate, and has had a great many other high honors conferred upon him; and from our early Territorial days to this hour he has always been a most faithful son and an honor to our State and to the West; and Colorado has always been and always will be proud of him.

He was an exceedingly efficient governor under desperately trying conditions, and he made a distinguished and most brilliant record in the Senate, as every one familiar with congressional proceedings from 1913 to 1921, inclusive, knows.

Colorado has always had a large and very exceptionally able bar, and he has been its outstanding leader for nearly 60 years. I doubt if that record has ever been paralleled in any other State in this Union.

While his devotion to Jefferson principles, his defiant refusal to ever trim his sails to any current breeze, his absolutely fearless expression at all times of his candid judgment on public affairs, and courageous action accordingly, utterly regardless of personal consequences, at times temporarily estranged many members of his party; nevertheless he has been the leading Democrat of the State practically all the time since Colorado was admitted into the Union 54 years ago.

He has succeeded Senator Henry M. Teller in the sincere and genuinely affectionate distinction of being Colorado's Grand Old Man.

Besides being a great and very successful lawyer and creditably filling every position of honor or trust he has ever held, he has during all that period been a most potent influence and public-spirited factor in shaping the destiny and in developing and upbuilding that great western empire during all the last half century.

He vividly pictures the pathetically deplorable lack of development of that great inland western region during the past 30 years and valiantly offers his services to help revive those States. His sublime courage and heroic spirit ought to be an inspiration to this and succeeding generations.

He has certainly one of the most keen, analytic, and brilliant minds the West has ever produced. No one has ever had to do any thinking or talking or writing for him. His entire career has been a great and exemplary success.

With the full and marvelous possession of all that superb mentality and intense interest in public affairs, he has reached the fourscore hilltop of life and can calmly, proudly, and gratefully look down the western slope into the declining years without the slightest personal ambition or motive other than his loyal, pioneer, and indomitable western spirit and earnest and patriotic determination to be of as much further service as possible to the people and that great Rocky Mountain empire that he has loved and so loyally toiled for from his boyhood days.

No one ever has or does know the West better than he, and I know his shrewd analysis and mature and profound judgment upon this far-reaching and tremendously important subject will be of universal interest and widespread benefit to the entire western half of our country.

His letter and statement are as follows:

JUNE 8, 1930.

MY DEAR SIR: I am inclosing a brief outline of the conditions confronting the public-domain States, which seem to justify the need for dealing with them as an economic problem.

I perhaps appreciate the difficulty of doing this as fully as anyone, since we are prone to regard all public problems as political, and therefore creating party divisions is obviously true as a rule. But there are exceptions to all rules, and this is emphatically one of them.

So long as the national administration, whatever its political complexion, perceives that a section of the country is politically divided upon one or more features of its policy which directly affects it, just so long will it persist in that policy, however obnoxious or injurious to both opponents and supporters. Hence, no substantial relief is obtainable under such conditions. But when the differences are for the time submerged in a common movement grounded upon a common conviction justified by the existence of a public grievance affecting the inhabitants of eight States, and growing more and more burdensome, the need for unanimity of action, whatever its character, becomes too obvious and too imperative for discussion.

The procedure for accomplishing this object involves nothing new. Each party organization adopts its own platform and nominates its own ticket as usual. But their declarations as to the administration of the public domain should be identical in substance, however they may differ in phraseology.

Such a course would eliminate the importance of election results as to the object in hand, since all successful candidates for both Houses of the National Congress would be committed to the same land policy and would cooperate for its attainment. Such a front presented at Washington by our respective delegations would, in my judgment, prove speedily effective all along the line.

Should the views herein expressed command your approval, I would suggest an informal conference in the near future for the formulation of a resolution upon the subject, reasonably acceptable to those whose leadership in both parties commands the confidence and support of their respective organizations. No one man is, I think, competent for this task and no one State would feel justified in undertaking it alone.

Having outlived all personal ambitions, and therefore conscious of no selfish purpose in taking the initiative on this tremendously important subject, I beg to assure you that my one object is to contribute, although in a small degree, to the enforcement of a public-land policy devoted to the welfare and betterment of the people where

it is located and among whom I have lived for more than half a century, who have honored me far beyond my deserts and who need whatever assistance I may be able to give them in this crisis of their existence.

Very sincerely yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

HON. E. T. TAYLOR, M. C.,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

UNCLE SAM, LANDLORD

Since 1900 something has been wrong with the public-domain States. Their growth in wealth and population up to that time was in step with the rest of the country. Their future seemed quite as promising. They were just beginning the development of a new industry to which their soil and climate was peculiarly adapted. Notable advances in metallurgy cheered them with the prospect of a long lease of gainful mining activity. Millions of acres of public domain whose resources craved development still awaited the miner and settler. Opportunity beckoned both as of yore. The horizon was clear and western ambitions as alert as ever.

Then our energies began to atrophy. Its earlier symptoms were scarcely noticed or suspected even when observed. They were mistaken for growing pains, and therefore of transient concern. But they became progressive in a double sense and under President Roosevelt's administration soon reached the dimensions of an organic disease. That aggressive ruler took the credit for announcing its appearance and baptized it as a reform. He even praised it as the antidote for a myth which he mistook for a malady. His successors avidly welcome his diagnosis and amplified his methods with improvements of their own. Under their treatment western growth has been practically arrested, and the atmosphere is dark with portents of graver misfortune.

The source of our troubles is the public domain, and the governmental agency for their infliction is the Interior Department, whose ruinous policy is camouflaged under the seductive name of conservation. This policy ostensibly designed to cure abuses developed under the former one, has succeeded only in developing new and graver ones, while expanding itself into a huge bureaucracy inspired with the ambition to extend its jurisdiction, increase its numbers, and perpetuate its power. Thus far its success has been most flattering, as the unhappy denizens of the Rocky Mountain States can testify.

When the original States transferred their land claims to the National Government and the Northwest Territory was established, it was assumed that this domain should be disposed of to the public, under regulations liberal in character and designed to encourage its settlement and occupation by the individual citizen. The acquisition of the Louisiana and Oregon Territories, the Mexican domain acquired by the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, and the purchase of Alaska were defended and justified by that supreme consideration. The Nation became custodian of the title and of the land for the benefit of the population present and future, charged with the duty of conveying both as and when the statutes relating to the subject should be complied with. This was done for more than a century and under that policy the frontier advanced within eight decades from the Alleghenies to the Pacific Ocean, peopled the waste spaces, and added 24 Commonwealths to the galaxy of the Union.

The act of March 3, 1807, providing for the leasing of the lead mines of Indiana Territory, and made operative in 1822, was the only departure from that beneficent policy during this period. But the act was denounced by President Polk in his message of December, 1845, as unprofitable, unsatisfactory, fraught with much future difficulty between lessees and the Government, and fruitful of litigation between the United States and its citizens. He urged the repeal of the statute and due provision made for the sale of the lands with a percentage of proceeds to the Government. Congress promptly complied with the President's request for its repeal, and the experiment ceased with the act of July 11, 1846. This wisely removed the one disfiguring feature of the national land policy.

Yet, 74 years later it was unhappily revised, reenacted, and applied to the entire public mineral domain, exclusive of that containing, or supposed to contain, metallic ores. But this having been previously included within the multitudinous forest reserves administered under an elaborate code of regulations by a bureau of adequate proportions, had previously been effectually excluded from private ownership. The forest-reserve acts were among the first fruits of conservation, and designed to shield the forest lands against the depredations of the despoiler. Yet that wily breed, consisting of great corporations, and operating entirely within the provisions of the acts, summarily acquired title to nearly all the remaining valuable timber reserves of the country. Reacting to this and similar practices relating to coal lands, the Government displayed its resentment by enacting legislation penalizing the individual citizenship of the western States by withdrawing most of its remaining land from location and purchase, and enormously increasing the difficulties and expense of acquiring title to that filed upon and occupied under older and un repealed statutes.

Thus far our "conservation" policy has woefully miscarried. Official exactions and sectional resentments are its immediate offspring.

Leases of oil reservations by a "faithless" secretary in exchange for "loans and gifts," and sales of royalty oils to privileged purchasers, followed by indictments, suits for rescission and damages, have vindicated President Polk's criticisms of the leasing policy, scandalized one administration and wholly condemned the system. Its minor evils, while not so spectacular, have been more widely distributed, and, therefore, much more disastrous.

These enactments, and their methods of enforcement, have completely reversed our popular and universally accepted national-land policy. The Government, through them, has repudiated its trusteeship for the people, and is now the adversary of the individual seeking to avail himself of his legal right to acquire a part of the public domain. It no longer encourages but thwarts as far as it can his laudable efforts in that regard. He is no longer considered by his Government as a valuable citizen ambitious to become a freeholder and taxpayer, but a fraud and a cheat, committed to a scheme of land piracy. So the hand of his Government is raised against him in pretended self-protection. To effectually shield itself against these unworthy men and women, it has determined to become a perpetual landholder and lease its dominions to its own people instead of selling them as heretofore.

Uncle Sam has thus converted himself into a landlord of continental dimensions. His erstwhile nephews of the West are now his tenants, mostly at sufferance. His Secretary of the Interior has necessarily undergone a sinister transformation. He is now the landlord's agent, and has long since absorbed all the heartless qualities of that justly abhorred character wherever he has been developed. He knows no interest save that of his employer, and holds the tenant to the rigid letter of the bond, if there be one. If not, he is warned not to trespass, under penalty of the law.

Hon. Hubert Work, while Secretary of the Interior, with characteristic candor, said: "When I came in here I learned I was to be trustee of the public lands, and had to keep these lands for the United States Government, and that has been the basis of the United States policy. I believe it to be my duty to so interfere with these applications for patents that they will become discouraged."

The Secretary spoke either by the sanction or with the acquiescence of his Government when he made this astounding announcement. He has ceased to be the official and impartial administrator of the land laws between the Nation and the citizen. He has become the governmental trustee of the public lands, charged with the duty of keeping them for it, although in defiance of the laws. That duty, however unwarranted, must be discharged, not by an honest consideration of applications for patents and leases but "by so interfering with them they will be discouraged."

It must be conceded that the department forces have recognized and applied this policy to unfortunate applicants seeking titles, and that his successors have bettered their instructions. They are sworn to execute the laws without fear or favor. Confessedly they use their power to destroy them.

For some years applicants for patents were required to abandon their claims and accept leases in lieu of them under the provisions of the leasing act. The right of the citizen to apply for permits to search for oil and gas under the same act was also grudgingly recognized. But even these rights have been arbitrarily ignored by Executive announcement. Eight days after his inauguration, President Hoover calmly informed a group of reporters that no more such applications would be received, and no more leases or permits would be granted. This bald act of repeal was not even dignified by the form of an Executive order. Two courts have since condemned it as an act of Executive usurpation and therefore unlawful, but the department has appealed and the *ukase* stands until the Supreme Court shall have disposed of it. Even should that tribunal sustain the decisions we have no positive assurance of relief. On the contrary, if we are to judge of a recent experience, we may be worse off with such a declaration than we were before.

I refer to the *Kruschnic* case, which flatly decided against the department ruling that delinquency in annual assessments automatically destroyed the claim, and returned the premises to the Government. The Supreme Court emphatically declared that the provision of section 2324 Revised Statutes applied to the claim just as it did prior to the leasing act.

That decision cost the owners of the premises many times the value of the premises involved. It required two extensive hearings before department officials, including the Secretary of the Interior, and three trials before as many courts. The attorneys for the owners went five times to Washington from their Denver homes, spent weeks at these trials, and were finally sustained in their contentions, only to have the fruits of their triumph turned by the Secretary to ashes on their lips.

For the department determined to possess itself of every mining claim which in its judgment had become delinquent in assessment work, and force the owner to proceed against it or give up the struggle. To this end it has scattered an army of its subordinates throughout the public-domain States, converted the force into lawbreakers, declared thousands of claims delinquent without hearing, ousted their owners by

its ipse dixit, notified them of its action, and told them they could do what they pleased about it, provided they did it within 30 days.

Thus has the Department of the Interior become a vast convocation of claim jumpers, lawbreakers by order of the Government, which is now the avowed, as it has long been, the all-powerful antagonist of the individual citizen, albeit he is acting wholly within and pursuant to the laws of his country.

Thus does our overlord now proceed against the legitimate occupants of the public land, who are forcibly deprived of their property without due or any process of law by their own Government, whose Secretary of the Interior proceeds against them in the triple rôle of owner, accuser, and judge. He tries, condemns, and punishes at one stroke, without the needless formality of notice and trial.

The West is overrun with an army of Federal land agents, field inspectors, examiners, detectives, investigators, ejectment squads, deputies, subdeputies, and emergency men, conducting a campaign under orders from Washington against all claimants and occupants of unpatented land. The object is the wholesale ouster of the citizen from his holdings and the extinction of his locations. This army is on the national pay roll and sustained by the taxes levied upon and paid by the victims of the lawless crusade.

We have no legal redress against the department by actual appeal to the courts. Our resources having been exhausted by scores of dilatory and expensive controversies before the Secretary and his commissioners, many of them inaugurated by that official, we can not wage additional ones, because we can no longer bear the burden and the heat of conflict. We can not sue in *forma pauperis*, because our overlord and Secretary has no authority to permit it, and would not do so if he could. But we have a precedent for collective action.

The revolt of our forbears against King George in 1776 was due to a series of "repeated injuries and usurpations," one of which was that "he has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance." The Rocky Mountain States have long suffered from this identical injustice, enlarged and revised by their own Government, and there is no sign that it will either modify or abandon its conduct until compelled to do so.

We must endure this condition or fight it. There is no other alternative. Our appeals to Congress and the courts have brought us no substantial relief and nothing less than united and persistent effort will. Our plight is a common one. It does not possess a single partisan feature. It is political only in the sense that it is public. Its proper solution is vital to the permanent well-being of our section. Hence its aspects and issues are fundamentally economic.

The Government applies its present policy impartially. It distinguishes not at all between Republicans and Democrats. It serves its supporters and its opponents alike. This is its sole virtue. It has the right to assume from past experience that we of the West will continue to extend our partisan differences into all such matters of public concern, thus keeping them immune to a final reckoning. If that assumption proves to be a sound one hereafter there seems but little prospect for relief from these intolerable conditions. If on the other hand we can make common cause for their overthrow, if the two great parties can at their coming assemblies take the same attitude and make the same declarations upon the subject, commit their candidates to the same cause of action regarding it, leaving each free to pursue its own course as to all other subjects of public or local concern, then it will matter not at all what the result of the public poll may be.

Determination to free ourselves from an abuse of continental dimensions involving the just and the unjust in common misfortune will then admit neither of division nor delay. We can not stop to discuss the law of self-preservation when resort to it is imperative. The hour is at hand when we must act together if we are to act at all.

The only effective weapon for inducing legislation whether good or bad is a lively apprehension of consequences. This has been so for 50 years. The powers that be will little heed the grievance of Utah or of Colorado, but eight States committed to a single purpose and convinced of its supreme importance to their people, their section, and their future, will be respected alike by official and politician. We have many examples which demonstrate the fact. Let us profit by them without delay.

C. S. THOMAS.

COPYRIGHT REGISTRATION OF DESIGN

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11852) amending the statutes of the United States to provide for copyright registration of design.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is interested in this bill, and is not present in the Chamber at the moment. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be temporarily laid aside pending his arrival.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FALSE REPORT RESPECTING CONDITION OF NATIONAL BANKS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10560) to amend section 22 of the Federal reserve act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRAND], the author of this bill, favored me with a copy of a letter that he sent to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER]. When the bill was last under consideration at the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] I asked that the bill be passed over without prejudice. This is the bill that was the subject of considerable controversy in the House on Calendar Wednesday, when the Committee on Banking and Currency had the call. I believe it was defeated or was laid aside. If the House took that position after thorough consideration, why should the bill be now taken up on the Consent Calendar? Has all the membership of the House changed front in respect to the propriety of passing the legislation?

Mr. McFADDEN. The bill has been entirely revamped, and I believe now would meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. In what particular has it been revamped? I have read the bill carefully.

Mr. McFADDEN. The objectionable features which were in the previous bill I think have been removed. It gives jurisdiction, however, to the Federal courts, which is the main point in the matter.

Mr. COLLINS. How can the Federal Government invade the police powers of the States and undertake to punish crimes committed in the States?

Mr. McFADDEN. I am not a lawyer, and the gentleman is, but I say to the gentleman that certain States have their own laws to protect their institutions in cases of this kind. The Federal Government has certain laws. Certain States, however, do not have such laws to protect cases like this.

Mr. COLLINS. If the Congress can enact legislation to punish for this particular offense, then the Federal Government can enact statutes against murder and larceny and invade the jurisdiction of the States. I believe it is a very bad idea for the Federal Government to attempt to take over such jurisdiction. I do not think the Federal Government can do it. It is without power to do so.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] that if we had had such a law as this a few months ago the Texas National Bank of Fort Worth, with \$5,000,000 of deposits from little country banks, would have been saved from being closed up, and it would have saved the country banks also, as their failures followed. It was just such malicious reports as are sought to be punished in this bill that caused the bank to be closed, and it caused lots of little State banks all over west Texas to close, as they had deposits in this Texas National Bank of Fort Worth.

Mr. COLLINS. As a legal proposition this bill is on all fours with the Dyer antilynching bill, and if the gentleman can vote for this bill he can vote for the Dyer antilynching bill. They both undertake to invade the police powers of the States.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not so agree. I think the Government has a right to protect its own national banks.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman elucidate further as to whether the courts of Texas were powerless and unable to meet the condition that he speaks of?

Mr. BLANTON. They have not met it yet, although Texas can protect its own State banks. This Texas National Bank of Fort Worth closed and lots of little Texas banks are closed, and the farmers with two, five, or ten thousand dollars deposits each, everything they had, were wiped out.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am amazed that any Member coming from the great State of Texas would admit that the State courts were powerless to meet that situation.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman ought to know that there are Federal laws that protect the national banks and State laws that protect the State banks, and it takes the Government of the United States to protect its national banks.

Mr. STAFFORD. In Wisconsin there is no such distinction. The remedy is with your legislature to give the same protection to national banks as to State banks.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman will not object, as such a law is needed badly.

Mr. McFADDEN. The State laws have no jurisdiction over national banks.

Mr. STAFFORD. The State laws have jurisdiction to punish crimes committed within their borders.

Mr. McFADDEN. In those States where we have no such law we should have Federal protection.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is attempting to justify this because of the lack of effort on the part of the States. That is what I heard years ago from the representatives of the banks of Illinois in favor of nationalization, because their legislature had not done its full duty in supervising their banks. I believe in local supervision and not in national, Federal, bureaucratic supervision. For the time being I shall ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. I understand that the Attorney General has sent an opinion on this subject to some Member, in which he says that the Congress does not have the power to enact this legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not acquainted with any such information.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. When?

Mr. COLLINS. I was just told that.

Mr. McFADDEN. There is no such letter that I have knowledge of as chairman of the committee. It is the first time that I have heard the question raised.

Mr. COLLINS. I have since been advised that the opinion of the Attorney General related to the larceny bill introduced by Mr. LaGUARDIA, but the principle in both bills, in my opinion, is the same.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his request?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will withdraw my request temporarily out of courtesy to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, in the first place, that I have never before heard of the statement from any human source like the one the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] has just given utterance to. I do not believe the Attorney General of the United States has written any such letter.

The gentleman's statement was "that he understood the Attorney General had sent some Member an opinion wherein he says that Congress does not have the power to enact this legislation." One should not quote the Attorney General of the United States upon an important legal question without knowing what he is talking about.

Hearings upon such legislation as is proposed in this bill were had to a limited extent by the Banking and Currency Committees of the Senate and House when the McFadden bill was up for consideration, and then approved by both committees. The bill approved by these committees was practically in the same language as the bill which I first introduced. However, all the objections made against this original bill by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] and others are eliminated from the present bill.

I want to call your attention to this information: The Comptroller of the Currency has recommended this legislation in his last two annual reports to Congress.

Hon. Ogden Mills, Undersecretary of the Treasury, a former distinguished Member of this House—and who will in all probability succeed Mr. Mellon when he resigns—I have every reason to believe is in favor of this legislation. Governor Young, of the Federal Reserve Board, in a letter to Chairman McFADDEN has approved and recommended enactment of this proposed legislation. Mr. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, in a letter to Mr. McFADDEN, has also indorsed this legislation. It has the hearty indorsement of the American Bankers' Association. If this bill is passed, it will have a strong deterrent effect on those who might desire to issue false and malicious reports concerning national banks. Besides, this bill deals with national banks, whereas all the State laws can deal, of course, with State banks. It has become a matter of common occurrence in various sections of the country, frequently reported by the press, that banks have been forced to close their doors due to false and malicious reports made and circulated relative to the financial standing of banks. I hold in my hand a special dispatch appearing in the New York Herald Tribune from Hartford, Conn., under date of May 26, 1930:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 27, 1930]

FALSE REPORT STARTS RUN ON HARTFORD BANK—300 ITALIAN CLIENTS WITHDRAW \$300,000 BEFORE CONFIDENCE IS RESTORED—PRIESTS HELP ALLAY FEARS—CITY BANK & TRUST CO. HAS \$30,000,000 IN DEPOSITS

HARTFORD, CONN., May 26.—As a result of a groundless rumor circulated throughout the Italian section here, more than 300 persons took part in a run on the City Bank & Trust Co. this afternoon and withdrew approximately \$300,000 before officials could convince them that the institution was on a sound basis. A squad of police reserves worked inside the bank and in the adjoining street to keep the deposi-

tors in line. Catholic priests from Hartford's east side mingled with the crowd and aided in restoring confidence in the bank.

Lester E. Shippee, State banking commissioner, said the action was stimulated by a "vicious report." He added that the bank, which is one of the strongest in Connecticut, with deposits aggregating \$30,000,000, was in excellent condition. State investigators and city detectives were ordered to trace the rumor to its source and to arrest the guilty persons.

The rush of the depositors began after an Italian who could not speak English was told by a clerk in the bank that he would have to be identified before he could cash a check there. Bank officials were of the opinion that the Italian misunderstood the teller and spread the baseless rumor concerning the funds on hand.

The report was accepted more readily because of the failure here last month of P. M. D'Esopo, a private banker. Many of the residents of Hartford's Italian section lost all of their savings in that crash.

Laborers dropped their picks and shovels, and owners of small shops locked their doors to join the crowd that was hurrying to the City Bank & Trust Co. One of the first of them withdrew \$32,000.

The Rev. Andrew J. Kelly, pastor of St. Anthony's Catholic Church, pleaded with his parishioners in the crowd to halt the run. He said that he had inspected the statement of the bank and found it to be in the best of condition. As the result of Father Kelly's efforts and similar activities by other priests, some of the depositors returned their money to the institution.

Mr. STAFFORD. What prevents the State authorities from prosecuting for a libelous attack on a bank?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. The gentleman is one of the able and seasoned legislators in this House, and he ought to know that there is a difference of opinion among good lawyers in the United States as to whether these State laws can be invoked in a case where such malicious and false reports are uttered against a national bank.

Mr. STAFFORD. Ergo, if a citizen of a State should murder a national officer the State would have no authority to take jurisdiction of that crime.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I do not subscribe to such doctrine. Only last week three Florida banks closed. The account of these failures appeared in last Friday's issue of the Daily News of this city. Let me read this newspaper item:

THREE FLORIDA BANKS CLOSED AFTER HARMFUL "TALK"

MIAMI.—Three affiliated banks, one of them among the largest in Florida, closed their doors yesterday. After failure of the Bank of Bay Biscayne to open, the Bank of Coral Gables and the Miami Beach Bank & Trust Co. closed.

The Bank of Bay Biscayne was capitalized at \$1,000,000 and had deposits of \$11,000,000. The other two had aggregated deposits of nearly \$2,000,000.

Frozen assets and harmful "talk around the State" were blamed by the office of State Comptroller Amos, at Tallahassee.

Just a month ago—and I want to call this to the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS]—according to a news item, a bank at Ittabena, Miss., closed its doors on account of false reports being circulated against the bank which was solvent. I read:

FALSE GOSSIP CAUSES BANK TO CLOSE DOORS

ITTABENA, MISS., May 11.—Dr. C. C. Moore, president of the First Savings Bank & Trust Co. of Ittabena, announced to-day that, because of "gossip and false statements" the bank would not open its doors to-morrow, although "absolutely solvent."

"Gossip and false statements caused the First Savings Bank & Trust Co. of Ittabena to close its doors for business Saturday, May 10," Doctor Moore said in a statement issued to-day. "The bank is absolutely solvent and not a depositor will lose one dollar. It is just a question of a few people becoming determined to close the institution. To be sure that no one would be hurt, it was decided to close up and pay off, which will be done with as little delay as possible."

The First Savings Bank & Trust Co. was the outcome of a merger last January 1 of the First Savings Bank and the First National Bank of Ittabena, the new institution operating as a State bank. It was capitalized at \$100,000. Deposits were said to total approximately \$500,000, with resources of about \$850,000.

All this occurred within the last six weeks.

At one of the meetings of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON], one of the ablest Members of this House, stated that two banks in his State had closed their doors because of false and malicious reports in regard to the financial condition of the bank during the last three months. During this year a bank located in Congressman VINSON's district had to close its doors, and I have been informed that it was largely due to false reports made by two persons. The failure of this bank was followed by two of its branches in one of the counties of my district. It is a well-known fact the Georgia National Bank of

Athens had to close its doors in 1925 on account, as I have been informed, of the false and malicious reports uttered relative to the financial condition of this bank made by one man.

From my experience as a lawyer of several years' practice, I am of the opinion that State laws can not be invoked in cases where false reports are uttered against a national bank, and therefore I think it becomes necessary to enact a Federal statute to take care of national banks.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. When the bill was last before the House one of the objections made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] was that the provisions of the bill if enacted into law might operate against the interests of the independent banks which are engaged in a fight with the chain banks. In this fight some rather extreme statements are made in their advertising. Until that safeguard can be insured, I wish that the gentleman from Georgia would not press this bill under the consent rule. The House should be given an opportunity to consider the legal phases more fully, to see how the bill will affect this bank advertising by both conflicting groups.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. This proposed legislation has been considered for several years both in the House and the Senate.

An answer to the situation set forth by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE] relating to his State, is this: That the provisions of the bill under discussion will apply alike to both of the conflicting groups of people referred to by him; that the provisions of the bill will not affect the attitude of either one of these conflicting groups. If the contrary is true it will affect both alike. There is absolutely nothing in the provisions of this bill which aids or injures the conflicting views of either one of the groups of banks referred to by the gentleman, and the provisions of this bill will not become applicable to either one or both of these groups and therefore not material to the situation set forth by the gentleman, unless some person connected with one of the groups issues false and malicious statements with intent to deceive relative to the financial condition of the banks and not then unless such false and malicious reports cause a general withdrawal of deposits.

In view of the fact that I have had so much opposition from time to time in my efforts to have the House to pass the bank-slander legislation first proposed by me four years ago, and particularly in view of the objections raised to the passage of the last bill—10560—on last Consent Calendar day, which bill eliminates all the objections raised, I have been wondering if any Congressmen entertain the conviction that I have a personal or individual interest in the passage of this bill. Whether this is true or not I wish to submit the following observations:

(a) No person, in or out of Congress, ever requested me to introduce any of the bills I have drafted upon this subject.

(b) No living person ever knew that I was going to introduce these bills.

(c) I consulted no banker before I introduced the same.

(d) I consulted no Member of Congress relative to introducing these bills.

(e) No person ever suggested to me to introduce this proposed legislation.

(f) I have no personal interest in sponsoring the proposed legislation.

My only interest in the passage of the present bill has been, and is, to afford further protection, if possible, to the depositors of banks throughout the Nation. This bill is primarily helpful and important to every person who has money deposited in the banks of the country. This is the sole purpose and object of the bill. For this reason it is inconceivable to me that any Member of Congress should oppose the passage of the bill. Confidence needs to be restored in the banks of the country and this bill will tend to bring about this result.

The original bill, known as H. R. 9683, introduced on February 19, 1930, and recommitment on March 5, 1930, which was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, is as follows:

A bill to amend section 22 of the Federal reserve act

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 of the Federal reserve act be amended by adding at the end thereof the following language:

"(g) Whoever maliciously, with intent to deceive, makes, publishes, utters, repeats, or circulates any false report concerning any national bank, or any State member bank of the Federal reserve system, which causes a general withdrawal of deposits from such bank, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction in any court of competent jurisdiction be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"(h) If two or more persons conspire to violate the above provision, and one or more of such parties do any act which effects the object of such conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction in any court of

competent jurisdiction be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"(1) Any bank official who maliciously, with intent to deceive, makes, publishes, utters, repeats, or circulates any false report concerning any individual which imputes or tends to impute insolvency, or unsound financial condition, or financial embarrassment to such individual, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction in any court of competent jurisdiction be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."

I call the attention of the House to an act of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, contained in the Acts of 1928-29 of Iowa, page 64, section 28, the same being very close kin to the above bill, which reads as follows:

False reports against banks and trust companies. Whoever maliciously, or with intent to deceive, makes, publishes, utters, repeats, or circulates any false report concerning any bank or trust company which imputes, or tends to impute, insolvency or unsound financial condition or financial embarrassment, or which may tend to cause or provoke or aid in causing or provoking a general withdrawal of deposits from such bank or trust company, or which may otherwise injure or tend to injure the business or good will of such bank or trust company, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years in the penitentiary or be punished by both such fine and imprisonment.

I also call attention to an act of the General Session of the State of Wisconsin, contained in the Wisconsin Statutes, 1927, page 2355, section 348.411, which is as follows:

Slandering commercial or financial standing: Any person who shall willfully and maliciously make, circulate, or transmit to another or others any false statement, rumor, or suggestion, written, printed, or by word of mouth, which is directly or by inference derogatory to the financial condition or affects the solvency or financial standing of any bank, savings bank, banking institution, building and loan association, investment company organized under section 216.04, or trust company doing business in this State, or who shall counsel, aid, procure, or induce another to start, transmit, or circulate any such statement or rumor, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for a term of not more than one year, or both.

I also call attention to an act of the State of New York contained in Gilbert's Annotated Criminal Code and Penal Law, 1929, page 100, section 303, which reads as follows:

False statements or rumors as to banking institutions: Any person who willfully and knowingly makes, circulates, or transmits to another or others any statement or rumor, written, printed, or by word of mouth, which is untrue in fact and is directly or by inference derogatory to the financial condition or affects the solvency or financial standing of any bank, private banker, savings bank, banking association, building and loan associations, or trust company doing business in this State, or who knowingly counsels, aids, procures, or induces another to start, transmit, or circulate any such statement or rumor is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

The original draft of "Slander and libel of bank act" as recommended by the American Bankers' Association in 1925, is as follows:

An act to punish derogatory statements affecting banks or trust companies

Be it enacted, etc., Any person who shall willfully and maliciously make, circulate, or transmit to another or others, any statement, rumor, or suggestion, written, printed, or by word of mouth, which is directly or by inference derogatory to the financial condition or affects the solvency or financial standing of any bank, savings bank, banking institution, or trust company doing business in this State, or who shall counsel, aid, procure, or induce another to start, transmit, or circulate any such statement or rumor, shall be guilty of a felony or misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for a term of not more than five years, or both.

The new bill, known as H. R. 10560, which was introduced on March 6, 1930, now pending before the House, is as follows:

A bill to amend section 22 of the Federal reserve act

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 of the Federal reserve act be amended by adding at the end thereof the following language:

"(g) Whoever maliciously, with intent to deceive, makes, publishes, utters, repeats, or circulates any false report concerning any national bank, or any State member bank of the Federal reserve system, which causes a general withdrawal of deposits from such bank, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction in any court of competent jurisdiction be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."

It will be observed that the bank slander act of the State of Iowa is not only practically the same as the bill I first intro-

duced, to which many objections were urged when it was before the House for consideration, and much more stringent than the one I last introduced, but that the Iowa act makes the offense a felony whereas the bill under consideration only makes it a misdemeanor.

It will also be observed that the Wisconsin act is very similar to the original bill to which objections were urged, and that the penalty provided in the Wisconsin act is heavier than the penalty provided for in the bill now under consideration.

It will also be observed that the New York act is broader and more stringent than the bill under consideration, and that the penalty provided for therein is likewise much heavier than the penalty provided for in the pending bill.

In view of all these facts, and it being apparent that State laws are not available or invokable to punish one who utters and circulates false reports with intent to deceive, relative to the solvency of national banks, thereby causing a general withdrawal of deposits, which generally leads to a failure of the bank, and it being an indisputable fact that State laws can not be invoked to protect banks in one State against false and malicious reports circulated by one in another State, I respectfully submit, in the interest of innocent depositors of banks of this Nation, further objection to the passage of the pending bill should be discontinued.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT HOOVER'S STATEMENT ON THE TARIFF BILL

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a statement made to-day by the President of the United States with reference to the new tariff law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a statement made to-day by the President of the United States with reference to the new tariff law. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by President Hoover on Monday morning June 16, 1930, stating his intention to and his reasons for approving the tariff bill:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I shall approve the tariff bill. This legislation has now been under almost continuous consideration by Congress for nearly 15 months. It was undertaken as the result of pledges given by the Republican Party at Kansas City. Its declarations embraced these obligations:

"The Republican Party believes that the home market built up under the protective policy belongs to the American farmer, and it pledges its support of legislation which will give this market to him to the full extent of his ability to supply it. * * *

"There are certain industries which can not now successfully compete with foreign producers because of lower foreign wages and a lower cost of living abroad, and we pledge the next Republican Congress to an examination and where necessary a revision of these schedules to the end that the American labor in these industries may again command the home market, may maintain its standard of living, and may count upon steady employment in its accustomed field."

Platform promises must not be empty gestures. In my message of April 16, 1929, to the special session of the Congress I accordingly recommended an increase in agricultural protection, a limited revision of other schedules to take care of the economic changes necessitating increases or decreases since the enactment of the 1922 law, and I further recommended a reorganization both of the Tariff Commission and of the method of executing the flexible provisions.

A statistical estimate of the bill by the Tariff Commission shows that the average duties collected under the 1922 law were about 13.8 per cent of the value of all imports, both free and dutiable, while if the new law had been applied it would have increased this percentage to about 16 per cent.

This compares with the average level of the tariff under the McKinley law of 23 per cent; the Wilson law of 20.9 per cent; the Dingley law of 25.8 per cent; the Payne-Aldrich law of 19.3 per cent; and the Fordney-McCumber law of 13.83 per cent.

Under the Underwood law of 1913 the amounts were disturbed by war conditions, varying 6 per cent to 14.8 per cent.

The proportion of imports which will be free of duty under the new law is estimated at from 61 to 63 per cent. This compares with averages under the McKinley law of 52.4 per cent; the Wilson law of 49.4 per cent; the Dingley law of 45.2 per cent; the Payne-Aldrich law of 52.5 per cent; and the Fordney-McCumber law of 63.8 per cent.

Under the Underwood law of 1913 disturbed conditions varied the free list from 60 to 73 per cent, averaging 66.3 per cent.

The increases in tariff are largely directed to the interest of the farmer. Of the increases, it is stated by the Tariff Commission that 93.73 per cent are upon products of agricultural origin measured in value, as distinguished from 6.25 per cent upon commodities of strictly nonagricultural origin. The average rate upon agricultural raw materials shows an increase from 38.10 per cent to 48.92 per cent in contrast to dutiable articles of strictly other than agricultural origin which show an average increase of from 31.02 per cent to 34.31 per cent. Compensatory duties have necessarily been given on products manufactured from agricultural raw materials and protective rates added to these in some instances.

The extent of rate revision as indicated by the Tariff Commission is that in value of the total imports the duties upon approximately 22.5 per cent have been increased, and 77.5 per cent were untouched or decreased. By number of the dutiable items mentioned in the bill, out of the total of about 3,300 there were about 890 increased, 235 decreased, and 2,170 untouched. The number of items increased was, therefore, 27 per cent of all dutiable items, and compares with 83 per cent of the number of items which were increased in the 1922 revision.

This tariff law is like all other tariff legislation, whether framed primarily upon a protective or a revenue basis. It contains many compromises between sectional interests and between different industries. No tariff bill has ever been enacted or ever will be enacted under the present system that will be perfect. A large portion of the items are always adjusted with good judgment, but it is bound to contain some inequalities and inequitable compromises. There are items upon which duties will prove too high and others upon which duties will prove to be too low.

Certainly no President, with his other duties, can pretend to make that exhaustive determination of the complex facts which surround each of those 3,300 items, and which has required the attention of hundreds of men in Congress for nearly a year and a third. That responsibility must rest upon the Congress in a legislative-rate revision.

On the administrative side I have insisted, however, that there should be created a new basis for the flexible tariff, and it has been incorporated in this law. Thereby the means are established for objective and judicial review of these rates upon principles laid down by the Congress, free from pressures inherent in legislative action. Thus, the outstanding step of this tariff legislation has been the reorganization of the largely inoperative flexible provision of 1922 into a form which should render it possible to secure prompt and scientific adjustment of serious inequities and inequalities which may prove to have been incorporated in the bill.

This new provision has even a larger importance. If a perfect tariff bill were enacted to-day, the increased rapidity of economic change and the constant shifting of our relations to industries abroad, will create a continuous stream of items which would work hardship upon some segment of the American people except for the provision of this relief. Without a workable flexible provision we would require even more frequent congressional tariff revision than during the past. With it the country should be freed from further general revision for many years to come. Congressional revisions are not only disturbing to business but with all their necessary collateral surroundings in lobbies, logrolling, and the activities of group interests, are disturbing to public confidence.

Under the old flexible provisions the task of adjustment was imposed directly upon the President, and the limitations in the law which circumscribed it were such that action was long delayed and it was largely inoperative, although important benefits were brought to the dairying, flax, glass, and other industries through it.

The new flexible provision established the responsibility for revisions upon a reorganized Tariff Commission, composed of members equally of both parties as a definite rate-making body acting through semijudicial methods of open hearings and investigation by which items can be taken up one by one upon direction or upon application of aggrieved parties. Recommendations are to be made to the President, he being given authority to promulgate or veto the conclusions of the commission. Such revision can be accomplished without disturbance to business, as they concern but one item at a time, and the principles laid down assure a protective basis.

The principle of a protective tariff for the benefit of labor, industry, and the farmer is established in the bill by the requirement that the commission shall adjust the rates so as to cover the differences in cost of production at home and abroad—and it is authorized to increase or decrease the duties by 50 per cent to effect this end. The means and methods of ascertaining such differences by the commission are provided in such fashion as should expedite prompt and effective action if grievances develop.

When the flexible principle was first written into law in 1922, by tradition and force of habit the old conception of legislative revision was so firmly fixed that the innovation was bound to be used with caution and in a restricted field, even had it not been largely inoperative for other reasons. Now, however, and particularly after the record of the last 15 months, there is a growing and widespread realization that in this highly complicated and intricately organized and rapidly shift-

ing modern economic world, the time has come when a more scientific and businesslike method of tariff revision must be devised. Toward this the new flexible provision takes a long step.

These provisions meet the repeated demands of statesmen and industrial and agricultural leaders over the past 25 years. It complies in full degree with the proposals made 20 years ago by President Roosevelt. It now covers proposals which I urged in 1922.

If, however, by any chance the flexible provisions now made should prove insufficient for effective action, I shall ask for further authority for the commission, for I believe that public opinion will give wholehearted support to the carrying out of such a program on a generous scale, to the end that we may develop a protective system free from the vices which have characterized every tariff revision in the past.

The complaints from some foreign countries that these duties have been placed unduly high can be remedied, if justified, by proper application to the Tariff Commission.

It is urgent that the uncertainties in the business world which have been added to by the long-extended debate of the measure should be ended. They can be ended only by completion of this bill. Meritorious demands for further protection to agriculture and labor which have developed since the tariff of 1922 would not end if this bill fails of enactment. Agitation for legislative tariff revision would necessarily continue before the country. Nothing would contribute to retard business recovery more than this continued agitation.

As I have said, I do not assume the rate structure in this or any other tariff bill is perfect, but I am convinced that the disposal of the whole question is urgent. I believe that the flexible provisions can within reasonable time remedy inequalities; that this provision is a progressive advance and gives great hope of taking the tariff away from politics, lobbying, and logrolling; that the bill gives protection to agriculture for the market of its products and to several industries in need of such protection for the wage of their labor; that with returning normal conditions our foreign trade will continue to expand.

TRAFFIC IN POISONOUS OR DELETERIOUS FOOD, DRUGS, ETC.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 730, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 730, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 730) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. PURNELL, and Mr. ASWELL.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, DIVISION OF SAFETY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 995) to create in the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor a division of safety.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOGG. Mr. Speaker, pending a report from the Labor Department, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Hogg]?

There was no objection.

FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10880) authorizing the construction of the Michaud division of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, an appropriation therefor, and the completion of the project, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION, FLOOD CONTROL

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12190) to authorize preliminary examinations of sundry streams with a view to the control of their floods, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there was considerable conversation, conference, and debate on this bill when it was last considered. My main objection is that I fear we are going to have an annual omnibus preliminary examination of sundry streams for flood control. If this proposition is going to degenerate into a river and harbor proposition, I want to know it.

Mr. JENKINS. I understood the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING], the last time this bill was considered, to say that he did not expect that to happen.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. May I ask my colleague from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] what he thinks about these surveys?

Mr. CRAMTON. Personally I think it is a very dubious program.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I did not feel I had all the responsibility.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. These surveys will cost quite a little money, and in my experience once we start the survey we might as well appropriate for the work.

Mr. JENKINS. I happen to know about one of the items involved which is a really very meritorious proposition.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. One of them?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is exactly it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is one in my State, I notice, the Fox River. If there is any occasion for flood control of the Fox River, there are 10 other rivers in my State that should have flood-control supervision.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is exactly the point.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have not introduced any bill for the control of the Milwaukee River, although it overflows and damage results, but I am considerate of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is the trouble of an omnibus proposition. There are some meritorious measures in it, but it has to be dragged in with many other propositions that do not have merit.

Mr. JENKINS. I wonder if the gentleman will permit it to go over?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Every time some old woman throws a bucket of water out of the window I do not want a survey made for flood control.

Mr. STAFFORD. Perhaps some of these streams will result in a flood by the throwing of a bucket of water into them.

Mr. SWING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am going to ask that this go over.

Mr. SWING. That is the same request which the gentleman made last time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. I have not been converted to it yet. I do not want to object to it.

Mr. SWING. As I stated before, it is merely a request for information.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; a request for information, but we are not so young and innocent. We have been educated in the school of rivers and harbors, and hence my attitude. My objection is not toward the gentleman personally, and he knows that. It is bad practice. Let each one be taken up on its own merits. The gentleman from Ohio has a good project, he says. The gentleman from Wisconsin immediately points out one that has not any merit.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would not say it has not as much merit as the other proposition.

Mr. SWING. This is a practice that has been followed in other communities.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Well, it is bad practice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA]?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER NEAR KANSAS CITY, KANS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10376) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Kansas City, Kans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been informed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER] that there have been actual bona fide expenditures of money made, that soundings have been made, that the expense of the plans has been met, and that there is justification for the extension of time.

Mr. GUYER. The plans have already been filed with the War Department.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I mean the detail plans, engineering plans?

Mr. GUYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And soundings have been made?

Mr. GUYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the approaches completed?

Mr. GUYER. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. On that assurance, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Kansas City, Kans., authorized to be built by the Interstate Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, by act of Congress approved May 22, 1928, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from May 22, 1930.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the figures "1928," insert "heretofore extended by act of Congress approved March 2, 1929."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "hereby," insert the word "further."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATURAL HISTORY BUILDING OF THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL MUSEUM

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11094) to authorize the extension of the Natural History Building of the United States National Museum.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I am correctly informed, the deficiency bill, which is now pending before this House, carries items for the construction of buildings in the District of Columbia that are clearly out of proportion to the needs of the country. In other words, that bill provides for the construction of buildings which, in my opinion, should not be authorized at the present time. If I am correctly informed, it is now the purpose to tear down the handsome District of Columbia Building. I venture to assert that if photographs were taken of that building and distributed in the congressional districts in which we have to run there is not a Member of the House who could be reelected if their constituents knew that such a building was to be torn down and destroyed in order to meet the wishes of a so-called commission.

Mr. STAFFORD. An æsthetic commission.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I do not know. It is some kind of a special commission which, in my opinion, is about to commit one of the most dastardly acts that has ever been brought to my attention since I have been a Member of this House. Not only is that true, but I understand it is the purpose to tear down the handsome stone Post Office Building, one of the best-constructed buildings to be found in the entire United States. As long as that commission functions in this way, the balance of the country is not receiving fair and just consideration. I hope you Members, when you go down Pennsylvania Avenue, will take a look at that monstrosity there in the way of a new building erected to take care of the Internal Revenue Bureau. I hope you will look at the roof. The back end of it, as I said the other day, looks like the roof over a chicken house and the side exposed to the street looks like the back end of a barn. It is probably the most unsightly building ever constructed in Washington. If that is art, then certainly I know nothing about art.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not ride in an automobile. I walk. I took occasion, since the gentleman made his scathing arraignment

ment of that mansard roof, to look at it. I found it conformed exactly with the roof on the new Commerce Building. The façade of that building is very appealing to me, with its columns and the like.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Did the gentleman look at the National Museum on one side and this building on the other? If the gentleman is not in accord with my views on the subject, I hope the other Members of this House will take a peep at that building as it appears from the Pennsylvania Avenue side. If there ever was an unsightly spectacle it is this creation of the special commission.

Mr. STAFFORD. The National Museum Building is of the old style, while the new building is of the modernistic style. Of course, that building appeals to me, because I am old-fashioned in my tastes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Then if we have a fine arts commission that is supposed to be able to distinguish between fine buildings, why did not they look at this National Museum Building when they were making plans to construct a building adjacent thereto.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman will permit, of course, the bill before the House is not related to the post office, and I am not going to enter into a debate with the gentleman on his æsthetic views or any views he has with reference to any particular school of architecture.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I want to say this, I am bringing this to the attention of the Members of the House, so they can look at this building as they go down Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I simply want to read a paragraph from the letter written by the chancellor of the Smithsonian Institution, now Chief Justice of the United States.

The United States National Museum is a treasure house of the products of the United States in fauna, flora, mineralogy, and archaeology. The collections have cost \$120,000,000, and could not be replaced for \$400,000,000. In order to take advantage of opportunities which may not be long available expeditions are sent out and gifts are received every year, which add numerous objects soon to become irreplaceable.

The additions average nearly 500,000 specimens a year. It is not desirable to give to other institutions more than a small part of these accretions, for the National Museum has become a principal headquarters for study by experts from all over the world.

He makes an appeal for the passage of this bill, and we ought to consider this bill on its merits without injecting into it unrelated subjects.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Who wrote that letter?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Chief Justice of the United States. I will put the entire letter in the RECORD.

The letter referred to follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1930.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Permit me, on behalf of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of which I am chancellor, to bring to your attention the bill authorizing the extensions of the Natural History Building of the United States National Museum. This bill (S. 3970) passed the Senate on May 8, 1930, and is now pending in the House of Representatives. We earnestly hope that you may see your way clear to promote the passage of this measure.

I understand the facts are these:

The United States National Museum is a treasure house of the products of the United States in fauna, flora, mineralogy, and archaeology. The collections have cost \$120,000,000, and could not be replaced for \$400,000,000. In order to take advantage of opportunities which may not be long available expeditions are sent out and gifts are received every year, which add numerous objects soon to become irreplaceable.

The additions average nearly 500,000 specimens a year. It is not desirable to give to other institutions more than a small part of these accretions, for the National Museum has become a principal headquarters for study by experts from all over the world.

The Natural History Building is now crowded. Even corridors are filled with cases. Workrooms are too crowded to give adequate facilities to workers. For example, workers from the United States Department of Agriculture, whose duty it is to examine insect specimens microscopically, are now crowded four to a window, so that there is neither adequate space nor light for their studies. No storage is longer available for large objects.

In order to relieve this congestion it is proposed to erect wings to the east and west of the building, to be uniform with the existing structure. They have been approved in principle by the Regents and Secretaries of the Smithsonian Institution, by the Fine Arts Commission, and I understand by the Bureau of the Budget. Their cost has been estimated approximately at \$6,500,000 by the Supervising Architect of the Treasury. The bill referred to above authorizes a future appropriation not exceeding \$6,500,000.

This is an enabling act, not an appropriation, but the authorization at this time will permit detailed plans to be drawn. The building can not be completed, if now authorized, before 1933, and the present congested condition will become by that time much more serious.

If you desire I shall be glad to call at any time that may suit your convenience to give any further information that may be at my command.

With high esteem I am faithfully yours,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

HON. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

Speaker House of Representatives.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I have a great deal of respect for any opinion that may be given by the Chief Justice, but it does occur to me that there is an enormous amount of construction provided for in the deficiency bill. I think there should be sufficient space provided to take care of everything that should be preserved. At present we can make temporary arrangements; then later, after the needs of the country have been taken care of to a certain extent, let us authorize a sufficient amount of appropriations to take care of the buildings that are needed in the District of Columbia.

I have no objection to constructing suitable quarters to take care of the needs of the Government. However, it seems to me to be a crime to authorize the expenditure of approximately \$20,000,000 to tear down buildings like the District of Columbia Building, made out of beautiful marble, and the Post Office Building, constructed from probably the best building stone in America, which, if allowed to remain, would be in good condition for several hundred years. I dare say that the arches and the general style of architecture in front of the Post Office Building is not to be excelled in the United States. In fact, I doubt if there is a better building to be found in the entire Nation. Yet because of a mania rampant in the minds of some persons who have certain power and authority, it is now proposed to tear down these buildings, which will mean the construction of edifices that will not be built nearly so substantial, and if built to conform with the Internal Revenue Building close by, it will not be but a few years until the same process of destruction will be put into effect, and more money will be squandered in the construction of new buildings to take their place. It is very evident that the building bought last year from the Southern Railway Co. at a cost of more than \$1,000,000 will be the next to suffer this same verdict, as there is apparently a wild orgy of money spending for the purpose of constructing buildings in the District of Columbia regardless of whether or not they are needed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman understands that Mr. Hughes is writing this letter in his capacity as one of the chancellors of the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. PATTERSON. And if the gentleman will yield, I may say that this need is immediate.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I wish the gentleman would prevail on his colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that I do not have any objection to the construction of buildings that are needed, but I do not want it all done in one year. I want some of this money appropriated by the Congress to be expended in the various districts of the United States in order that our people may have some of the conveniences rather than authorizing so many to be constructed at one time in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman knows that separate and distinct authorizations and appropriations are made for this purpose, and this has nothing to do with that question at all. It does not cut into the appropriations, and I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. GREENWOOD. If the gentleman will permit, I do not think we ought to enter into a controversy here over the different styles of architecture, which is a matter in the hands of a commission. There may be some merit in what the gentleman says, or there may not be, but the point at issue here is whether we are going to extend a building which will house a museum of natural history, which is one of the most important places in the District of Columbia in the way of education, and where the people who visit this Capital get more of educational value than any other institution here. I do not think we ought to enter into a controversy about side issues. We ought to undertake what Chief Justice Hughes has urged us to do, and that is to provide housing facilities for these specimens of natural history, which will make this a treasure house of the entire United States, and will be a matter of benefit to anyone who visits the Capital.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And serve a scientific purpose as well.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The position I take is that instead of paying \$11,000,000 to construct a new post-office build-

ing to take the place of the handsome Post Office Building now on the Avenue—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Keep the Post Office Building out of this.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am putting it in, and I think instead of spending a lot of money to tear down the splendid, lovely District of Columbia building, we should use that money for purposes of this kind rather than to so increase expenditures that there will not be a fair distribution, taking into consideration the various districts of the country.

Mr. STAFFORD. Aestheticism is running rampant and we are running wild in our expenditures along this line.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I understand three objections are necessary.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma and Mr. STAFFORD objected.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I understand the bill was passed over without prejudice before.

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; it was objected to and went off the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. According to the calendar, the bill has been objected to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA demanded the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hears only two objections. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill S. 3970, which is identical, may be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Smithsonian Institution is hereby authorized to extend the Natural History Building of the United States National Museum by additions on the east and west ends thereof, in accordance with plans to be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, and to engage, if necessary, architectural and inspection services, without regard to the restrictions of existing law governing such services. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not exceeding \$6,500,000 for this purpose.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) for the payment of certain employees of the United States Government in the District of Columbia and employees of the District of Columbia for March 4, 1929.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me it is rather unseemly to come here with a bill to provide the payment of salary to some employees who took a holiday, just because they are not included in general law. By the time distribution is made, the cost of administering this bill will be almost as much as the benefits to be derived from it. It does no one person any particular good and I do not think it is a good precedent to establish.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, Chairman WILLIAMSON could not be here to-day, and asked me to look after this bill. It will not cost much to administer the bill, I am sure. For a great many years these employees have been given a holiday on Inauguration Day.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. And it is held now that there is plenty of authority in law to pay them if an Executive order had been issued but in this particular case there was no Executive order issued. I understand this to be the first time an order has not been issued in many years. It was evidently an oversight.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Can not the defect be cured permanently so that every four years we will not have a bill like this?

Mr. COLTON. That ought to be done, but it has not been done, and if we do not pass this resolution these men will be deprived of this pay. It is a good measure. These men ought not to be discriminated against.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does this resolution come up every four years?

Mr. COLTON. No; because heretofore an Executive order has been issued.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Reserving the right to object, are there not other groups of employees who took the day off and who are not coming in under this bill?

Mr. COLTON. No. I understand practically all others have been paid.

Mr. GREENWOOD. What group of employees is this?

Mr. COLTON. Mostly those who work at the navy yard. There are only a few others.

Mr. GREENWOOD. And this is because there was not an Executive order issued which was simply an oversight in conforming with the practice followed on previous inauguration days. Has it always been the rule to issue such an Executive order?

Mr. COLTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. GREENWOOD. And we are attempting to correct by this bill what ought to have been covered by an Executive order?

Mr. COLTON. That is it exactly.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The hearings show that there are only a small number of these men.

Mr. GREENWOOD. How many men are involved?

Mr. COLTON. Four thousand five hundred at the navy yard and a few others.

Mr. GREENWOOD. And how much money is involved?

Mr. COLTON. It would be difficult to state. Probably \$5 or \$6 a day for this number of men.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill sets a bad precedent, because if it is passed it will undoubtedly bring about eventually Inauguration Day as a holiday in the District of Columbia. I wish that every Member here would read the splendid speech made by our former colleague, Hon. James R. Mann, on this floor against the proposal to make Lincoln's birthday a holiday. It is one of the most logical and best speeches against additional holidays I ever heard on the floor of the House. He spoke of Lincoln's inclination to work rather than shirk. I object to this bill, because ultimately it would eventuate in creating a new holiday here in the District of Columbia. This would be unfair to the thousands of Government employees located in the 48 States of this Union.

AUTHORIZING THE MENOMINEE TRIBE OF INDIANS TO EMPLOY GENERAL ATTORNEYS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8812) authorizing the Menominee Tribe of Indians to employ general attorneys.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS. Reserving the right to object, it strikes me that this is a peculiar bill. It gives authority to some one in the Indian tribe to employ lawyers to see if the Government does not owe something to this tribe.

Mr. BLANTON. To the amount of \$20,000 or more, if the original bill is passed instead of the amendment.

Mr. BROWNE. Let me say to the gentleman that the Menominee Indians occupy 10 townships in my district in Wisconsin. They have in the Treasury a fund of from one million and a half to two million dollars. They run an extensive lumber business in Wisconsin. They have a mill and plant there which is valued at something like a million and a half or two million dollars. They have certain claims against the Government.

Mr. JENKINS. Why, then, do they not employ lawyers and pay them?

Mr. BROWNE. Under the law they can not employ a lawyer without coming to and getting authority from Congress. They can not raise money even to send a delegate here. All they ask is for Congress to allow them to take the money out of their own fund and employ lawyers, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. JENKINS. And none of this money will come out of the United States Government?

Mr. BROWNE. Not a cent.

Mr. JENKINS. Then I have no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Further reserving the right to object, does this include the handling of such claims, or simply to pay the lawyers for filing something that they may call a claim?

Mr. BROWNE. These Indians have claims against the United States Government. They have filed claims against the Government. I introduced a bill for them, but to prepare their case and present it to the Court of Claims they must have a lawyer.

Mr. CRAMTON. When a bill passes authorizing them to present a claim to the Court of Claims that will authorize the employment of lawyers and provide for their payment. This

bill has nothing to do with filing any claim in the Court of Claims.

Mr. BROWNE. Let me say that this tribe of Indians have around 2,000,000,000 feet of standing timber.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am perfectly familiar with that; I have visited their reservation and I know their financial condition; but that does not mean that we have to make a present of \$20,000 to the Wisconsin lawyers.

Mr. BROWNE. I will say that they do not intend to employ Wisconsin lawyers. The attorneys will be employed under the advice and consent of the Secretary of Interior.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; I do not think so; this is an authorization of hiring by Congress, and it is not left in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BLANTON. This bill is going to be objected to, so why take up the time of the House?

Mr. BROWNE. I ask unanimous consent for a couple of minutes. I think if Members understand the matter that no one will object. This provides that the contract for attorneys shall be subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior.

Now, they find it very difficult to conduct their business of running this large mill without being incorporated, and having to come to the Secretary of the Interior for everything they do. They can not make progress if they are compelled to do that.

Mr. CRAMTON. The Indians are not running that mill, but even granted that the matter the gentleman now urges is valid, they do not need any \$20,000 pay roll for lawyers annually.

Mr. BROWNE. If the gentleman will permit me to make my explanation, I shall try to do it and see whether it meets his objection. They believe, and the Secretary of the Interior after explanation believes, that these Indians could run their own business, or at least have something to do with their own business if they are incorporated.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am 100 per cent opposed to all of these new-fangled incorporation ideas. That is the best scheme that has yet been devised to fritter away the assets of the Indians.

Mr. BROWNE. I want to explain for a minute or two, because I believe that if the gentleman understands what they intend to do he will not object. These Indians, in the first place, are one of the most intelligent tribes of Indians that we have. They not only enlisted in every war but more Menominee Indians have volunteered in proportion to the population than any like number of people in the United States. They were not subject to draft.

Mr. CRAMTON. That can be said of the Indians generally.

Mr. BROWNE. They are an intelligent tribe of Indians. They have been on this reservation ever since the first white man came to Wisconsin, which was about the year 1650. They have valuable property to administer. They have over a million and a half dollars in the Treasury, and yet they can not send a delegate under the present law to talk with their Congressman who represents them without getting permission from the Indian Department and being allowed out of their own funds enough money to come down here. When I brought the matter up before the Secretary of the Interior with Mr. Rhoads and Mr. Scattergood, they were opposed to the bill at first, as the gentleman is. We went over the matter very carefully. I told these Indians that if they needed attorneys they should get the best attorneys they could find. They consulted with the Hughes-Dwight firm, of New York. They seemed to think that they had a case against the Government, and they also thought that they could help them in incorporating or forming some sort of a cooperative organization so that they could do their business and learn to do business and have some initiative and improve their condition.

Mr. CRAMTON. When it comes to the matter of presenting a claim against the Government, if there is any valid and substantial claim, I am not disposed to get in the way of it; but when it comes to hiring attorneys to prepare papers of incorporation, to let some corporation be formed to administer the assets of these Indians, I am 100 per cent against it, and you can not pass any bill by unanimous consent that has anything to do with that.

Mr. BROWNE. They have a claim that they think is valid against the Government.

Mr. CRAMTON. But the report of the department talks about incorporation.

Mr. BROWNE. That is another matter, too. In presenting their claim they have got to get good legal advice as to whether the claim is good or not.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If Wisconsin can send some of the strongest men we have here to sit on this floor who receive an annual

salary of only \$10,000, why can not these Indians get lawyers cheaper than \$20,000 a year?

Mr. BROWNE. This provides for not to exceed \$6,000 a year for two years, subject to the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; if the bill is adopted and not the amendment, it permits them to employ a general attorney at \$20,000 per annum, or even more if they can get it approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BROWNE. They pay it out of their own funds.

Mr. BLANTON. It is after all the Indians' money, and they ought to have it themselves, and greedy attorneys should not get it.

Mr. BROWNE. There are about 2,000 members of this tribe, and it would not amount to \$10 apiece.

Mr. CRAMTON. But if this bill goes through, it gives the shadow of approval of Congress to the idea of incorporating the Indians. A bill of that kind was introduced for the Klamath Indians, and I guess everybody has abandoned it.

Mr. BROWNE. They do not know whether it is a good thing for them to incorporate or not.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think that Congress knows that it is not.

Mr. BROWNE. We do not know until we find out what they propose to do.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL POST ROADS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7585) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I hope not to be obliged to do it, because I think it is a desirable bill, but as it stands the bill does not accomplish anything. It authorizes Congress hereafter to authorize an appropriation. To be effective it ought to at least authorize appropriations. I can understand that the legislative committee that has charge of public roads may very well desire to not present a permanent authorization for appropriations. They may desire to have it in shape so that when the general State aid and the forest road authorization is made next time this would be before them and would be included. In order to accomplish that I have prepared an amendment. On page 2, line 11, after the word "section," insert "including not more than two and a half million dollars for each of the fiscal years 1931, 1932, and 1933, hereby authorized to be appropriated," so that it will read:

Such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize to be expended under the provisions of this section, including not more than two and a half million dollars for each of the fiscal years 1931, 1932, and 1933, hereby authorized to be appropriated—

And so forth.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman, the Committee on Roads has had this bill before it for about three years, and there has been a great deal of contention in various directions. Finally the committee has, with the departments, agreed upon legislation which will take care of the public-land situation as it has already taken care of the forest roads.

In other words, this is new legislation, so far as public lands are concerned. Up to date the Government has paid nothing for the construction of highways on the public lands. This is a new departure and the Government assumes the responsibility of building roads in the public lands of the public-land States. The committee did not investigate at this time the question as to how much this authorization should be, and it was agreed by all of those interested that at this time there should be no authorization in the bill at all, but that it should be followed next year by an investigation of the subject, and then the committee would have some backing for whatever legislation it desired to recommend.

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand the gentleman's committee has already brought in for passage at this session legislation authorizing Federal aid to the States for the next fiscal years 1931, 1932, and 1933.

Mr. DOWELL. 1931 was authorized at the last time.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; 1932 and 1933; and increased it?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. And also they have brought in legislation authorizing appropriations for forest roads for these same three years.

Now, the passage of this bill, while it reads nicely, does not produce any money. Before any money could be appropriated

for this purpose another bill would have to pass Congress authorizing an appropriation.

As the gentleman knows, I have some contact with these problems. There is a law authorizing \$250,000 for roads on Indian reservations. That was intended as a relief measure. The Senate increased that amount to three-quarters of a million dollars. In conference they agreed to recede on the promise I made to get this legislation through. I do not feel that I am keeping faith with those gentlemen to pass a bill which is authorizing that legislation. I am not insistent as to the amount, but I would like to see even a million dollars appropriated. But I am not insistent about 1931. The Budget feels the money is pretty well spent for 1931. But I suggest that in the fiscal years 1932 and 1933 there should be appropriated some given amount. Then thereafter the rest of the bill remains just as the gentleman's committee has recommended, so far as that feature is concerned.

Mr. DOWELL. The Committee on Roads has given this matter quite serious consideration. The Committee on Roads will be here, if this law is enacted, with an authorization.

Mr. CRAMTON. When?

Mr. DOWELL. In the next Congress.

Mr. CRAMTON. For the fiscal years 1932 and 1933?

Mr. DOWELL. I think so.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not care to take part in some ceremony here that will not produce roads.

Mr. DOWELL. I can not give absolute assurance, but I will say that it is the intention of the Roads Committee to take this matter up and investigate the subject and report at the next session of Congress.

Mr. CRAMTON. The committee has already recommended such legislation as this—legislation authorizing definite appropriations—which was passed by Congress and unfortunately vetoed by the President. That was two years ago.

Mr. DOWELL. That was only temporary.

Mr. CRAMTON. This is not even temporary.

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; this provides permanent law for the distribution of this fund when it is authorized and appropriated, and that is as far as the committee desired to go.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman give us assurance that if this bill goes through his committee will take up the preparation of an authorization?

Mr. DOWELL. It is the intention of the committee to take this up at the next session of Congress and make an investigation and report as to what should be done.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, I am disappointed in that. I think it would be better to definitely dispose of it in this bill. As I understand, the gentleman from Iowa would not accept such an amendment as I have suggested?

Mr. DOWELL. I feel I could not do it, because the committee has not investigated the subject matter.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then, if the gentleman will not accept the amendment, and would rather have the bill fail than accept that amendment, I am not going to insist on the amendment. Aside from the gentleman's assurance, which is helpful, I do not think this bill means much. I suggest an amendment to the language, beginning page 2, line 18:

The roads constructed and maintained under the provisions of this section shall be the same standard as to width and character of construction as the Federal Government requires of the States under like conditions.

I think that ought to be eliminated because it is a purely Federal road matter, and it ought to be left to Congress and the department to provide the kind of road desired. I think they can build a cheaper road and find it satisfactory—cheaper than this would require.

Mr. DOWELL. I can not give the gentleman a definite assurance, but the committee has no desire that the department construct more expensive roads.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is that amendment agreeable to the gentleman?

Mr. DOWELL. I would not want to consent to that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then I will have to object to the bill, because without the amendment, it will mean extravagant roads. If the amendment goes through it would not be a question of what the committee wanted. It would mean that Congress tied the hands of your committee as well as of the department. All I am asking is that the committee and the department have free hands. I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman from Iowa not accept the proposed amendment?

Mr. COLTON. I wish the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] would accept the amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. I happen to know that the Director of Public Roads has made extensive studies in the West with a view to building roads sufficient for the traffic, but not up to the standard which this would require. I shall have to object to the bill unless the amendment is allowed.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are others who will have to object also because it is an impracticable provision. The width of roads over the mountains would be very different from the width of roads on the level.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman from Michigan state the amendment again, please?

Mr. CRAMTON. My proposed amendment is simply to strike out the language in the sentence just before the proviso. If that sentence goes out it leaves it up to the gentleman's committee and the future action of Congress and the department. I think they would get more roads for the same money if they do not have their hands tied in that way.

Mr. DOWELL. I am willing to consent to that amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute Senate bill (S. 3258) for the House bill. It is a similar bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill S. 3258 will be substituted.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal highway act, approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. L. 212), as amended or supplemented, be further amended by amending the second paragraph of section 3 of said Federal highway act to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the State highway departments and with the Department of the Interior, in the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations other than the forest reservations. Such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize to be appropriated under the provisions of this section shall be apportioned among those States having more than 5 per cent of their area in the lands hereinbefore described and shall be prorated and apportioned to said States in the proportion that said lands in each of said States is to the total area of said lands in the States eligible under the provisions of this section, and no contribution from the States shall be required in the expenditure thereof. The roads constructed and maintained under the provisions of this section shall be of the same standard as to width and character of construction as the Federal Government requires of the States under like conditions: *Provided*, That in the allocation of any such funds authorized to be appropriated under this section or any subsequent act preference shall be given to those projects which are located on the Federal-aid highway system as the same are now or may hereafter be designated.

"The Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare, publish, and distribute a map and other information, at least annually, showing the progress made in the expenditures of the funds authorized under this section."

SEC. 2. All acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, line 14, of the Senate bill, strike out the words "the roads constructed and maintained under the provisions of this section shall be of the same standard as to width and character of construction as the Federal Government requires of the States under like conditions."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the gentleman from Iowa another amendment. This road building will be chiefly across unreserved public lands and Indian reservations. The forests and parks are taken care of otherwise. When it comes to an Indian reservation I think Indian labor should be employed as far as possible. We have a general law of that kind. My suggestion is to put in the bill this sentence, "where such construction is upon an Indian reservation, Indian labor shall be used so far as possible."

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. Inasmuch as we are seeking to amend the basic law, I am wondering if it would not be better to put this language in the authorization bill when it is brought out instead

of this bill. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the policy of employing Indians where practical.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, if it is not forgotten.

Mr. ARENTZ. The gentleman from Michigan is the one who will handle it.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; I will have nothing to do with it.

Mr. ARENTZ. When it comes to the appropriation I think the gentleman will have his ear and his eye upon it.

Mr. CRAMTON. No. I will not handle it when it comes to the appropriation.

Mr. COLTON. I will say to the gentleman that we will try not to overlook it, especially wherever it is practical.

Mr. CRAMTON. If it is in the law now we will know it is there. I offer the amendment.

Mr. ARENTZ. I think the basic law should be as concise as possible, and by putting that language in the bill it will enlarge the basic law. It will hamper the reading and study of it.

Mr. CRAMTON. There will be much grief with your bill if it is not put in there, when you come in with an authorization, because this is a fundamental policy which I am following. We are trying to help the Indians. When it comes to the construction of a road on an Indian reservation, why should you not use Indian labor as far as possible? I think it should be placed in the fundamental law. If not, every two years we will have to watch to see what you are doing.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. If this construction work is done by a contractor, would not a contractor be greatly embarrassed by having to figure on Indian labor, some of which is not very satisfactory as compared with white labor?

Mr. CRAMTON. The amendment simply provides Indian labor shall be used so far as possible.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. ARENTZ. I think it would be just as well to place in this law a statement to the effect that alien labor should not be used.

Mr. CRAMTON. I certainly would not object to it.

Mr. ARENTZ. And that the going wages of the county in which the work is done should also be paid, so that outsiders could not come in and cut the wages prevalent in that particular district.

Mr. CRAMTON. I know my friend from Nevada, and I do not take that too seriously. I know the gentleman is interested in the welfare of the Indians of Nevada as much as any of us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. As a matter of fact, in western Washington we have found that the so-called fish-eating Indian is not concerned in getting road work, and this trouble in connection with the contractor would come in.

Mr. CRAMTON. I find this committee is not very receptive to new ideas. I will not press the amendment, but I will just serve notice that when they come along for appropriations and authorizations they had better put it in. I think there are enough Members in the House interested in the proposition to insist on it.

Mr. COLTON. We are in sympathy with the gentleman on that.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, there is another amendment, but I am unable to get the law from the document room, which might be added to this bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let us put that along with this Indian matter and not have too much in the fundamental law.

Mr. DOWELL. It is a provision which requires the department when the contract is above \$5,000 to submit it to bids. That provision I think would not be objected to.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not sure but what if it is across an Indian reservation we might prefer to have it constructed by day labor, so as to use the Indian labor instead of being tied up to a competitive contract.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLTON. I want to express deep appreciation on the part of all Western States for the passage of this measure. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How about the Eastern States, who pay a great deal of the taxes?

Mr. COLTON. I will say to the gentleman from New York that nearly all of the good-road associations of this country have indorsed this measure. It has been indorsed by the

national and western associations of highway officials. We are all interested in the building of a great system of Federal-aid roads, and automobile associations all over the country have indorsed the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, we do appreciate the help of the chairman of the Roads Committee. He and the other members of the committee have been patient and helpful.

I want also to express appreciation to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. He has assisted greatly from the beginning. Always friendly to the West, he has been interested in working out some method of relief. The same may be said of other Members. We certainly are grateful.

For a number of years Congress has been making authorizations for the construction of the roads on the Federal-aid system through the national forests. However, the Federal Government is still many years behind in its road-building program even through the national forest as compared with the States in the completion of the other roads on the Federal-aid system. The Federal-aid system in many of the States outside of the forests and public domain is practically completed, but it will take the Federal Government an average of 43 years to build the roads on the Federal-aid system through the forests as the program is now being carried out.

When we turn to the consideration of roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, we find the situation even worse. There has been no special provision whatever for building roads through these lands, yet there are almost 100,000 square miles of unappropriated and unreserved public lands in the Western States in excess of the square miles of forest areas.

This bill amends the act approved July 11, 1916, and would make it possible for Congress in the future, after an authorization bill has been passed, to appropriate for the construction of roads across the unreserved and unappropriated public lands in the United States. This money could only be used in a State having in excess of 5 per cent of the total area of all its lands in unappropriated public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, and will be apportioned in these States in the proportion that said public lands, in each of said States, is to the total area of said lands in the State eligible under the provisions of this act.

BOOKS FOR THE ADULT BLIND

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11365) to provide books for the adult blind.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, several weeks ago, when this bill was called up on the Consent Calendar, it was objected to by the gentleman from California [Mr. CRAIL]. At that time, in view of the fact that I favored appropriations to provide books for the adult blind—in fact, more liberal appropriations than were embodied in either the bill now before the House or the Crail bill—I thought he showed poor judgment in objecting to the consideration of this bill. However, subsequent to the date of his objection, the Committee on Education held very extensive hearings on this blind legislation, and the testimony presented to that committee and the lack of facts and testimony presented by the head of the American Printing House for the Blind, of Louisville, Ky., has forced me to reach the conclusion that this bill should be defeated and that appropriations should not be made until the Committee on Education has had an opportunity to carefully consider all angles of this blind book appropriation question. In view of those circumstances I must necessarily voice my objection to the consideration of this bill at the present time, and I certainly hope that if the legislation comes before the House in the closing days of the session under suspension of the rules that the House will vote it down, so that the Committee on Education will have an opportunity to carefully complete its hearings and study.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAIL, Mr. HALL of Illinois, Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin, and Mr. KYALE objected.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to extend my remarks on H. R. 11365 and to include therewith extracts from the laws relating to the American Printing House for the Blind and statements submitted to the House Committee on Education on H. R. 9052.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the zeal of some of the proponents of H. R. 9052—known as the Crail bill—has been of such a character that I fear they have permitted themselves to question or attack, without due thought or consideration, the wise and efficient conduct of one of the oldest, most beneficent institutions of the country, the American Printing House for the Blind, located at Louisville, Ky. The bill referred to has for its purpose the authorization of an annual Federal appropriation of \$100,000 payable to what is known as the Braille Institute of America (Inc.), located at Los Angeles, Calif., for the publication of books for the adult blind, the same to be circulated through the public libraries of the country. This bill is pending before the House Committee on Education. Hearings were had thereon on the 28th of May, 1930. A bill having in view the like purpose of furnishing books for the adult blind, under the like annual authorization of \$100,000, is H. R. 11,365—known as the Pratt bill. The Pratt bill provides that the funds which it authorizes shall be expended under the direction of the Librarian of Congress, and with authority of the Librarian to arrange with such libraries as he may judge to be appropriate as local or regional centers for the circulation of such books.

No committee action has been taken on the Crail bill, but the Committee on the Library of the House, to which the Pratt bill was referred, conducted hearings on that measure, and on April 9, 1930, favorably reported it, and it stands on the calendar awaiting House consideration. However, a measure identical with the Pratt bill was introduced during the present session in the Senate by Senator Smoot, and was favorably reported on May 9, 1930, by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor; on May 12 it was passed by the Senate; and on May 16 it was referred to the House Committee on the Library.

I may say that I heartily indorse the general object of these measures—the furnishing of books for the use of the adult blind readers of the States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia. For the purposes of the present discussion, I do not know that it is necessary for me to express any opinion touching the relative merits of the measures. The charge has been made in the hearings on the Crail bill that the Pratt bill was designed to benefit the American Printing House for the Blind to the disadvantage of the Braille Institute of America, already mentioned; and, upon this assumption, and in apparent resentment because thereof, the proponents of the Crail bill attack and seek to discredit, it would appear, the work and management of the American Printing House for the Blind. I consider this attack as not only most unjust, but also as most unwise, even from the standpoint of the advocates of the Crail bill.

I have every reason to believe that those responsible for the operation and management of the American Printing House for the Blind have not brought about the introduction of the Pratt bill, any more than they have been responsible for the introduction of the Crail bill. Possessing, as they do, the keenest sympathy for the needs of all our blind population, and conducting with marked success an institution which prints and furnishes books and apparatus for the blind pupils of the country, they would very much like to see enacted legislation to meet the requirements of the adult blind; and they might believe that the provisions of one or the other bill might best serve this purpose; but I am sure that they have not brought about the introduction of either measure.

The appearance of some of those connected with the management of the American Printing House for the Blind, before the House Committee on Education, at the Crail bill hearings was for the purpose of defending the American Printing House for the Blind, against the attack which, it was understood in advance would be then and there made by the advocates of the Crail bill and which, in fact, was made. The American Printing House for the Blind is located in my congressional district; the members of its active board of trustees live in my district; and I am generally familiar with the operation of the institution; and since I have been a Member of the House I have been glad to aid the institution's very beneficent work in every way possible. I know that no one connected with the institution has ever suggested to or requested of me that I support the Pratt bill or oppose the Crail bill. If any of those so connected with the American Printing House for the Blind were involved in any effort to defeat the Crail bill or to promote the Pratt bill, it is very strange that thus far they have never advised me of their position nor urged my assistance, since I am the Representative for the Louisville district, and from time to time I am consulted by the trustees touching legislation affecting the American Printing House.

Hence I fail to see how the proponents of the Crail bill can hope to gain anything by any criticism or attack on the Ameri-

can Printing House for the Blind, which has behind it a record of more than 70 years of splendid service for the student blind of the Nation. It has been tried and tested. It has proven its worth. However, in view of the criticisms which have been made at the indicated hearings before the House Committee on Education, and because of certain intimations which have been made on the floor of the House I have deemed it appropriate to give, in this manner, some general statement of the history and work of the American Printing House for the Blind and to include as a part of these remarks some of the acts, local and Federal, and parts of acts dealing with this institution and its policies, together with certain statements and data of an informative character. I can hardly believe that the proponents of any of the pending measures would desire, upon a full understanding of the facts, to do any injustice to the institution and its management.

The printing of books and publications for the blind has never been an inviting field so far as private enterprise is concerned, because the demand involved has been of a very limited character. Thus it was that the State of Kentucky became a pioneer in dealing with the subject. Not able to secure, in adequate or satisfactory manner, books and apparatus for the use of its own sightless youth, and responsive to a wide demand therefor, the State, through its general assembly by act of January 20, 1858, provided for the establishment of the American Printing House for the Blind, at Louisville; and, for the purpose of providing for the management and operation of the institution, created under the act the trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind with seven members. These trustees were clothed with full corporate power to do all things necessary for the conduct of the business of the institution; and constitute a corporate body, with the flexible, useful powers conferred. The corporate body has no authorized shares of stock, and has not a dollar's worth of outstanding stock or its equivalent. It is conducted wholly without private profit or benefit, and only for a highly beneficent public purpose, nationwide in scope and character. The creation of this institution was actuated by the highest motives and, in order that schools for the blind for the country at large might fully share in the benefits to be derived from its operation, this original act of 1858 provided (sec. 7) that—

Every school for the blind, located in a State whose legislature or citizens contribute to the funds of the American Printing House for the Blind, shall, in proportion to the funds contributed, be entitled to copies of every book published by said house, to be distributed gratuitously to such blind persons as are unable to purchase them. * * *

The prices of books published by this institution shall be made so low as merely to cover the cost of publication and other incidental expenses of the institution.

The act just referred to is as follows:

An act to establish the American Printing House for the Blind, approved January 20, 1858

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Kentucky—

SECTION 1. That an institution, under the name of the American Printing House for the Blind, shall be established in Louisville, Ky., or its vicinity, and that James Guthrie, William F. Bullock, Theodore S. Bell, Bryce M. Patten, John Milton, H. T. Curd, and A. O. Brannin, and their successors, be, and they are hereby, declared a body corporate, under the name and style of the trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind, with the right as such to use a common seal, to sue and be sued, to plead and be impleaded, in all courts of justice and in all cases in which the interests of the institution are involved. The said trustees are hereby fully empowered to receive by legacies, conveyances, and otherwise, lands, money, and other property, and the same to retain, use, and apply to the publishing of books in raised letters for the blind; and they are authorized to purchase land and erect, purchase, or rent buildings for the use of the said institution, and to make all such contracts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of their incorporation. They are hereby invested with the same privileges in regard to the copyright of books published by them as are enjoyed by natural persons. Said trustees shall appoint a superintendent or general agent, and such other agents as may be necessary, may prescribe their duties, and fix the term of their offices, and the amount of their compensation: *Provided, however,* That no contract entered into by any officer or agent, where money is to be paid out, shall be binding until ratified by the trustees. The said trustees are hereby invested with the same powers and privileges in regard to the copyright of books published by them as are enjoyed by natural persons. The trustees may adopt from time to time such by-laws, rules, and regulations as they may deem necessary, provided they are not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States or of this State.

SEC. 2. The trustees shall elect annually a president, a treasurer, and a secretary, who shall hold their offices until their successors shall be

elected and duly qualified. Said trustees may prescribe the duties and fix the compensation of said officers.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of said trustees to hold an annual meeting and other stated meetings at such times as they may appoint, and such special meetings as may be called by the president. It shall be the duty of the trustees first named in this act to call the first meeting of the board within 20 days from and after the approval of this act.

SEC. 4. The trustees shall require from the treasurer, before he enters upon the duties of his office, his bond, in the penalty of not less than \$20,000, payable to the president, or his successors in office, of the board, conditioned that he will take care of and account for all money and other property of the institution that may be intrusted to him and that he will well and truly perform all the duties of his office.

SEC. 5. The said trustees shall have power to invest in the hands of the treasurer, when to them it shall seem expedient, by way of loan, at any legal rate of interest, to be secured by mortgage on real estate unencumbered and of double the value of the amount loaned, the interest in all cases to be paid semiannually.

SEC. 6. It shall be the duty of the board of trustees before commencing the publication of any book to request the superintendent of every institution for the education of the blind in the United States to make out and send to the trustees of the printing house a list of such books as he may deem most desirable for the use of the blind, and said trustees shall select for publication the book that shall have received the greatest number of superintendents' votes in its favor. This mode for selecting books for publication shall be repeated at least once every year.

SEC. 7. Every school for the blind, located in a State whose legislature or citizens contribute to the funds of the American Printing House, shall, in proportion to the funds contributed, be entitled to copies of every book published by said house, to be distributed gratuitously to such blind persons as are unable to purchase them. And the superintendents of said schools shall be required to report to the trustees of said house the names and residences of all persons to whom books may be thus distributed. The prices of books published by this institution shall be made so low as merely to cover the cost of publication and other incidental expense of the institution.

SEC. 8. It shall be the duty of the board of trustees to make an annual report of their proceedings, which embrace a full account of the receipts and disbursements, the funds on hand, number of books sold, and the number distributed gratuitously, and a general statement of the condition of the institution; and they shall transmit copies of said reports to the General Assembly of Kentucky, to the governors of the States of the Union, to the president of each State board of trustees, to the superintendent of every institution for the education of the blind in the United States, and to every person who shall make to the institution a donation of more than \$5 the previous year.

SEC. 9. The donation of \$500 by one person shall constitute him a patron of the institution, and his name shall be so published in the annual reports. Any person who shall make a donation of more than \$500 shall also be entitled to embossed books equal in value to the excess of his donation over and above \$500.

SEC. 10. The presidents of the State boards of trustees shall, ex officio, constitute a board of visitors, each member of which shall be at all times authorized to visit the printing house, examine the books, and investigate the proceedings of the trustees; and the president of the oldest State board of trustees shall, at the written request of a majority of the visitors, call a meeting of the board of visitors, who shall be fully empowered to investigate the proceedings of the trustees of the institution; and in case they shall find that said board, or any member thereof, has mismanaged the affairs of said institution by malfeasance in office or neglect of duty, they may (a majority of three-fourths of all the members present concurring) declare the offices or office of said trustees or trustee vacant, and proceed to fill the vacancy by election from the citizens of Louisville or its vicinity. Notice of all meetings of the board of visitors shall be sent by mail to all the presidents of the State boards and to all the trustees of the printing house at least one month before the time appointed for said meetings.

SEC. 11. The trustees of said printing house shall continue in office until their offices shall become vacant by resignation, death, or removal from office, as hereinbefore provided for. All vacancies caused by resignation or removal shall be filled by the remaining members of the board.

SEC. 12. That each donor shall be entitled to his donation with the interest, after deduction of the necessary expenses paid, provided said publishing house is not established within nine years from the passage of this act; and should the board refuse to make said distribution among the donors, according to their respective interests, then and in that event said donors may have the right to proceed to recover the same by legal proceedings, instituted in any of the courts of this Commonwealth having jurisdiction thereof.

It will be noted that under the act of 1858 no profit was permitted in the publication of books for the blind (sec. 7); that the heads of the schools for the blind throughout the United States constituted an ex officio board of visitors, with authority at all times to visit the American Printing House and to examine the books and investigate the proceedings of the trust-

tees; with power, also, to declare vacant the executive trusteeships in any cases of mismanagement (sec. 10); and the superintendents of all the institutions for the education of the blind in the United States were given the right to select the books for publication for the use of the blind (sec. 6). All these provisions, in their substantial form, have continued as the law from the date of that enactment to the present time.

The act of 1858 was amended by the act of the Kentucky General Assembly of April 3, 1861, as follows:

An act to amend the charter of the American Printing House for the Blind, approved April 3, 1861

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Kentucky—

SECTION 1. That an institution, under the name of the American Printing House for the Blind, shall be established in Louisville, Ky., or its vicinity, and that James Guthrie, William F. Bullock, Theodore S. Bell, Bryce M. Patten, William Kendrick, John G. Barrett, and A. O. Brannin, and their successors, be, and they are hereby, declared a body corporate, under the name and style of the Trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind, with the right as such to use a common seal, to sue and be sued, to plead and be impleaded, in all courts of justice and in all cases in which the interests of the institution are involved. The said trustees are hereby fully empowered to receive by legacies, conveyances, or otherwise, lands, money, and other property, and the same to retain, use, and apply to the publishing of books in raised letters for the blind; and they are authorized to purchase land and erect, purchase, or rent buildings for the use of said institution, and to make all such contracts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of their incorporation. They may appoint such officers and agents as may be necessary, may prescribe their duties, and fix the term of their offices and the amount of their compensation: *Provided, however,* That no contract entered into by any officer or agent involving the payment of money shall be binding until ratified by the trustees. The said trustees are hereby invested with the same powers and privileges in regard to the copyright of books published by them as are enjoyed by natural persons. The trustees may adopt from time to time such by-laws, rules, and regulations as may be legal and proper.

SEC. 2. The trustees shall elect annually a president, a treasurer, and a secretary, who shall hold their offices until their successors shall be elected and duly qualified. Said trustees may prescribe the duties and fix the compensation of said officers.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of said trustees to hold an annual meeting and other stated meetings at such times as they may appoint, and such special meetings as may be called by the president or secretary.

SEC. 4. The trustees shall require from the treasurer, before he enters upon the duties of his office, his bond, with satisfactory security, that he will take care of and account for all money and other property of the institution that may be intrusted to him, and that he will faithfully perform all the duties of his office.

SEC. 5. The said trustees shall have power to invest any money in the hands of the treasurer, when to them it shall seem expedient, by way of loan, at any legal rate of interest, to be secured by mortgage on real estate unencumbered and of double the value of the amount loaned, the interest in all cases to be payable semiannually.

SEC. 6. It shall be the duty of the board of trustees, before commencing the publication of any book, to request the superintendent of every institution for the education of the blind in North America to make out and send to the trustees of the printing house a list of such books as he may deem most desirable for the use of the blind; and said trustees shall select for publication the book that shall have received the greatest number of superintendents' votes in its favor. This mode of selecting books for publication shall be repeated at least once every year.

SEC. 7. Every school for the blind located in a State whose legislature or citizens contribute to the funds of the American Printing House shall, in proportion to the funds contributed, be entitled to copies of every book published by said house, to be distributed gratuitously to such blind persons as are unable to purchase them. And the superintendents of said schools shall be required to report to the trustees of said house the names and residences of all persons to whom books may be thus distributed. The prices of books published by this institution shall be made so low as merely to cover the cost of publication and other incidental expenses of the institution.

SEC. 8. It shall be the duty of the board of trustees to make an annual report of their proceedings, which shall embrace a full account of the receipts and disbursements, funds on hand, the number of books sold, and the number distributed gratuitously, and a general statement of the condition of the institution; and they shall transmit copies of such reports to the General Assembly of Kentucky, to the Governors of the States in North America, to the president of each State board of trustees, to the superintendent of every American institution for the education of the blind, and to every person who shall have made to the institution a donation of \$5 the previous year.

SEC. 9. The superintendents of State institutions devoted exclusively to the education of the blind, and the governors of the States that aid in sustaining the American Printing House for the Blind, and the

presidents of the State auxiliary boards of trustees, shall, ex officio, constitute a board of visitors, each member of which shall be at all times authorized to visit the printing house, examine the books, and investigate the proceedings of the trustees; and the president of any State board may, at the written request of a majority of the visitors, call a meeting of the board of visitors, who shall be fully empowered to investigate the proceedings of the trustees of the institution; and in case they shall find that said board, or any member thereof, has mismanaged the affairs of said institution by malfeasance in office or neglect of duty, they may (a majority of three-fourths of all the members present concurring) declare the offices or office of said trustees or trustee, vacant, and proceed to fill the vacancy by election from the citizens of Louisville or its vicinity. Representatives from a majority of the States that contribute to the support of the American Printing House for the Blind shall constitute a quorum of the board of visitors, and each State represented shall be allowed 1 vote in the action of the board. Notice of every meeting of the board of visitors shall be sent by mail to all members of the board, and to the trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind, at least one month before the time appointed for the meeting.

SEC. 10. The trustees of said printing house shall continue in office until their offices shall become vacant by resignation or removal from office, as hereinbefore provided for. All vacancies caused by resignation or removal from the State shall be filled by the remaining members of the board.

SEC. 11. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

In 1865 the General Assembly of Kentucky passed an act for the benefit of the American Printing House for the Blind, as follows:

An act for the benefit of the American Printing House for the Blind, approved June 3, 1865

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Kentucky—

SECTION 1. That there shall be, and hereby is, appropriated to the American Printing House for the Blind, located in Jefferson County, Ky., \$5 annually for every blind person in the State of Kentucky, according to the census of the United States, to aid the institution in printing books in raised letters for the blind and in furnishing the same gratuitously to the indigent blind and at cost to others in accordance with the provisions of the charter of the said printing house for the blind granted by the Legislature of Kentucky.

SEC. 2. That the third section of the amended charter of the American Printing House for the Blind, approved April 3, 1861, be so amended as to read as follows, viz:

"It shall be the duty of said trustees to hold an annual meeting and other stated meetings at such times as they may appoint and such special meetings as may be called by the president or secretary."

SEC. 3. That the tenth section of such amended charter of said printing house for the blind be so amended as to read as follows, viz:

"The trustees of said printing house shall continue in office until their offices shall become vacant by resignation, neglect to act, death, removal from the State, or removal from office as hereinbefore provided for. All vacancies caused by resignation, neglect to act, death, or removal from the State shall be filled by the remaining members of the board."

SEC. 4. That the auditor is directed to draw his order on the treasurer, in favor of the superintendent of the institution, for the sum appropriated by this act.

SEC. 5. That this act shall take effect from its passage.

In 1880 the General Assembly of Kentucky passed a further act in relation to the American Printing House for the Blind, as follows:

An act to amend an act to establish the American Printing House for the Blind, and the amendments thereto, approved February 28, 1880

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky—

SECTION 1. That the first section of the amended charter of the American Printing House for the Blind, approved April 3, 1861, be, and is hereby, so amended as to read as follows: "And in addition to the trustees named in this section, the superintendents of public institutions for the education of the blind in the United States, the Territories, and the District of Columbia, be, and hereby are, constituted ex officio members of the board of trustees."

SEC. 2. That the annual subsidy of \$5 for each blind person in the State of Kentucky, now paid to the American Printing House for the Blind by virtue of an act of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, approved June 3, 1865, shall cease from and after the date of the payment by the auditor of the Commonwealth to the treasurer of the American Printing House for the Blind of all arrearages due under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to benefit the American Printing House for the Blind," approved June 3, 1865.

SEC. 3. That this act shall take effect from its passage.

These enactments constitute the general basic State law on the subject with the exception of certain appropriation legislation not herewith included.

It should be stated that the action of the State of Kentucky in establishing the American Printing House for the Blind in 1858—as already indicated—was not alone because of its inability to secure books, in character systems, for its blind students, but was actuated also by the request of those in various sections of the United States; that Kentucky—which was esteemed as having a wise and progressive policy in dealing with the problems of the blind—should undertake the work for the benefit of the schools for the blind throughout the country. Thus it was that, from the beginning, the superintendents of the schools for the blind of the various States and Territories have been ex officio visitors or trustees of this institution; have selected the books for publication; and have received for these State and Territorial schools books and apparatus for the blind pupils at actual cost, with no overhead of real estate or plant accounted for.

As I understand the history involved, the State of Kentucky, out of its own resources, and without contribution for the purpose by any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia, procured the necessary site, of more than 6 acres, in Louisville, and built thereon the necessary structures, and supplied the necessary equipment for carrying on the work of the institution—a work performed for the benefit of the student blind throughout the country and for no other purpose or benefit. As recently as 1923 the State of Kentucky appropriated and there was used the sum of \$25,000 for the construction of a new and greatly needed building for the American Printing House for the Blind.

Subject to the general powers of the ex officio visitors or trustees, created by the Kentucky acts already cited and by Federal law as well, the active trustees have conducted the affairs of the institution without profit and without charge for seventy-odd years of service. In the very nature of the case, these active trustees had to be citizens of the Louisville community, as the institution is located there. Thus no travel or other expenses have been incurred by the active trustees. All the property used by the institution is held and owned by the trustees, as a body corporate, under the indicated Kentucky laws. In my judgment the value of the property thus owned and held by the trustees for the benefit of the entire blind school population of the United States is \$135,000 or more; and the State of Kentucky does not receive a penny's worth of advantage over any other State or Territory because of its splendidly generous contribution to the cause of nation-wide education of the blind. I include, at the close of these remarks, the statement for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, showing the distribution quotas of books and apparatus made and furnished to the States and Territories and the District of Columbia by the American Printing House for the Blind; which statement is taken from the printed report of the institution for that year. The statement shows that the total value of books and apparatus received by the State of Kentucky that year was \$1,405.62, an amount exceeded by many other States.

The unselfishness of this policy of the State of Kentucky seems to be misunderstood in some quarters. In fact, apparently it constitutes a ground for suspicion that this generosity of the State is induced by some sinister and hidden motive. However, I am sure that no one who is thoroughly familiar with the history of these matters, covering nearly three-quarters of a century, can have any judgment on the subject except one of deep gratitude and esteem for Kentucky's course throughout and for the efficient operation of the American Printing House for the Blind through all these years. Kentucky having founded the institution, and having contributed so generously to its creation and operation, very naturally has felt a pride in its achievements; and, in consequence, the State's best citizenship has been called on to conduct its active management.

Because considerations of the indicated character appealed to those having in charge the education of the blind children of America, and to Congress as well, in 1879 there was enacted by Congress a measure having for its purpose the authorization of an annual appropriation of \$10,000 for aiding in the education of the blind of the entire country through the American Printing House for the Blind. That act is as follows:

An act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879

Be it enacted, etc., I. That the sum of \$250,000, out of money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, be, and hereby is, set apart as a perpetual fund for the purpose of aiding the education of the blind in the United States of America through the American Printing House for the Blind.

II. That the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States is hereby directed to hold said sum in trust for the purpose aforesaid. And it shall be his duty, upon the passage of this act, to invest said sum in United States interest-bearing bonds, bearing interest at 4 per cent, of the issue of July, 1870, and upon their maturity to reinvest their proceeds in other United States interest-bearing bonds, and so on forever.

III. That the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States is hereby authorized to pay over semiannually to the trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind, located in Louisville, Ky., and chartered in 1858 by the Legislature of Kentucky, upon the requisition of their president, countersigned by their treasurer, the semiannual interest upon said bonds upon the following conditions:

"1. The income upon the bonds thus held in trust for the education of the blind shall be expended by the trustees of the American Printing House each year in manufacturing and furnishing embossed books for the blind and tangible apparatus for their instruction. And the total amount of such books and apparatus so manufactured and furnished by this income shall each year be distributed among all the public institutions for the education of the blind in the States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia upon the requisition of the superintendent of each, duly certified by its board of trustees. The basis of such distribution shall be the total number of pupils in all the public institutions for the education of the blind, to be authenticated in such manner and as often as the trustees of the said American Printing House shall require; and each institution shall receive in books and apparatus that portion of the total income of said bonds held by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States in trust for the education of the blind, as is shown by the ratio between the number of pupils in that institution for the education of the blind and the total number of pupils in all the public institutions for the education of the blind, which ratio shall be computed upon the first Monday in January of each year.

"2. No part of the income from said bonds shall be expended in the erection or leasing of buildings.

"3. No profit shall be put on any books or tangible apparatus for the instruction of the blind manufactured or furnished by the trustees of said American Printing House for the Blind, located in Louisville, Ky., and the price put upon each article so manufactured or furnished shall only be its actual cost.

"4. The Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall have the authority to withhold the income arising from said bonds thus set apart for the education of the blind of the United States whenever he shall receive satisfactory proof that the trustees of said American Printing House for the Blind, located in Louisville, Ky., are not using the income from these bonds for the benefit of the blind in the public institutions for the education of the blind of the United States.

"5. Before any money be paid to the treasurer of the American Printing House for the Blind by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States the treasurer of the American Printing House for the Blind shall execute a bond, with two approved sureties, to the amount of \$20,000, conditioned that the interest so received shall be expended according to this law and all amendments thereto, which shall be held by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and shall be renewed every two years.

"6. The superintendents of the various public institutions for the education of the blind in the United States shall each ex officio be a member of the board of trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind, located in the city of Louisville, Ky."

IV. That the trustees of said American Printing House for the Blind shall annually make to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States a report of the items of their expenditure of the income of said bonds during the year preceding their report and shall annually furnish him with a voucher from each public institution for the education of the blind, showing that the amount of books and tangible apparatus due has been received.

V. That this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

This act remains in full force and effect. It recognizes and confirms for purposes of the Federal contributions authorized the general provisions of the State acts already cited. Every reasonable safeguard is imposed by the Federal enactment so as to protect the Federal and State Governments. Among other things, it provides that the books and apparatus be distributed to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia pro rata, according to their respective blind-pupil populations; that no part of the income (the Federal contribution) shall be expended in the erection or leasing of buildings; that no profit shall be put on any books or tangible apparatus for the instruction of the blind manufactured or furnished by this institution; and that the price put upon each article so manufactured or furnished shall be only its actual cost (sec. 3).

The act also provides for the proper bonding of the institution's treasurer; for the serving of superintendents of institutions for the blind throughout the country as ex officio members of the board of trustees of the institution—section 3. Also the act requires that the trustees of the American Printing

House make annual report to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of the expenditure of all Federal funds so contributed; and to furnish the Secretary of the Treasury, annually, vouchers from all the State, Territorial, and District of Columbia institutions showing the books and tangible apparatus, respectively, received by them each year. The only sources of receipts or income the institution has are (1) the Federal funds referred to and (2) some incidental profits arising from work performed for private or other nonschool purposes.

Attention is especially directed to section 4 of the act of 1879, just quoted, which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to withhold the Federal contribution to the American Printing House for the Blind whenever he shall receive satisfactory proof that such contribution is not being properly used. The affairs of the institution have been so well managed throughout that the Secretary of the Treasury has never felt it necessary, so far as I am advised, to exercise this authority.

By-laws adopted by the board of trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind at an annual meeting in Baltimore, Md., in 1888, yet in force, provide, among other things, as follows:

The annual report of the American Printing House for the Blind shall contain a classified statement of all receipts and expenditures and an inventory showing the description and value of all property and stores on hand at the close of each fiscal year. All expenditures shall be made upon itemized vouchers duly verified, and shall be audited and approved by not less than three members of the executive committee. All vouchers covering expenditures of money derived from the National Treasury shall constitute a separate series and shall be executed in duplicate, the duplicates of which shall belong to the files of the institution, and the originals shall be filed in the United States Treasury Department.

In 1906 Congress enacted the following measure setting apart as a perpetual trust fund the sum of \$250,000, and providing that the sum of \$10,000, the equivalent income of this trust fund, be annually appropriated for the benefit of the American Printing House for the Blind, agreeably to the terms of the Federal act of March 3, 1879, already cited. This act (approved June 25, 1906) did not increase the Federal contribution under the act of 1879; it simply made that contribution perpetual. The act of 1906 is as follows:

An act to modify the requirements of the act entitled "An act to promote the education of the blind," approved March 3, 1879

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$250,000 heretofore invested in United States registered 4 per cent bonds, funded loan of 1907, inscribed "Secretary of the Treasury, trustee, interest to the Treasurer of the United States for credit of appropriation 'To promote the education of the blind,'" shall upon the maturity and redemption of said bonds on the 1st of July, 1907, in lieu of reinvestment in other Government bonds, be set apart and credited on the books of the Treasury Department as a perpetual trust fund; and the sum of \$10,000, being equivalent to 4 per cent on the principal of said trust fund, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and such appropriation shall be deemed a permanent annual appropriation and shall be expended in the manner and for the purposes authorized by the Act approved March 3, 1879, entitled "An act to promote the education of the blind," approved March 3, 1879.

The needs of the sightless children of America increased. Improvements of great value in the printing of books for the blind were brought about and the systems unified. The affairs of the American Printing House for the Blind had been handled to the satisfaction of the State and Federal executive officials dealing with the subject, and to the satisfaction of Congress, as well. In consequence, in 1919, there was enacted by Congress an act authorizing an additional annual appropriation of \$40,000 for the use of the American Printing House for the Blind, to be expended agreeably to the act of Congress of March 3, 1879. The act of 1919 is as follows:

An act providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind, approved August 4, 1919

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of enabling the American Printing House for the Blind more adequately to provide books and apparatus for the education of the blind there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to it in addition to the permanent appropriation of \$10,000 made in the act entitled "An act to promote the education of the blind," approved March 3, 1879, as amended, the sum of \$40,000, which sum shall be in accordance with the requirements of said act to promote the education of the blind.

Increased appropriations were accordingly made by Congress, and again the increased needs of the blind children of the country caused congressional action to be taken to augment

the annual Federal contribution for their benefit to be expended, as theretofore, through the American Printing House for the Blind. In consequence, I had the honor, and I may add, the very great pleasure, of introducing in Congress in 1926 a bill to increase from \$40,000 to \$65,000 the annual authorization provided in the act of 1919, just cited. Full hearings before the House Committee on Education were had on the measure; it received the unanimously favorable report of the Committees on Education in both Houses; and, without a dissenting vote, passed both Houses and became a law. It is as follows:

An act to amend the act providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind, approved February 8, 1927

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind," approved August 4, 1919, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That for the purpose of enabling the American Printing House for the Blind more adequately to provide books and apparatus for the education of the blind, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to it, in addition to the permanent appropriation of \$10,000 made in the act entitled 'An act to promote the education of the blind,' approved March 3, 1879, as amended, the sum of \$65,000, which sum shall be expended in accordance with the requirements of said act to promote the education of the blind."

Thus there are now being made annual Federal appropriations in the total sum of \$75,000, for the benefit of the blind children of America, through the American Printing House for the Blind in the publication of books and in the making of tangible apparatus; and all this is being done agreeably to and in conformity with the provisions of the act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

I now quote the following extracts from the favorable report of the House Committee on Education on the bill which became a law on February 8, 1927, just referred to:

The purpose of the bill is to amend the act approved August 4, 1919 (Stat. L. 1919-1921, vol. 41, p. 272), which authorized an annual appropriation of \$40,000 for the printing of books and the making of tangible apparatus for the blind in the United States and the Territories. This \$40,000 authorization was in addition to the \$10,000 annual authorization made by the act of March 3, 1879 (Stat. L. 1877-1879, vol. 20, pp. 467-469). By these two acts an annual total of \$50,000 has been authorized for the indicated purpose; and appropriations have been accordingly made. Under the act of 1879, yet in force, and constituting the basic law on the subject, the funds appropriated are absolutely restricted to the printing of books (chiefly textbooks) and the making of tangible apparatus (raised maps, charts, etc.) for use of the blind in the various schools and institutions throughout the United States and its Territories and the District of Columbia. No part of these appropriations can be used for the construction or leasing of buildings or grounds or for any purpose except that already named. The State of Kentucky, a pioneer in the work of giving instruction to the blind, in 1858 incorporated under Kentucky law the American Printing House for the Blind, and in Louisville, Ky., erected and equipped the necessary buildings for engaging in the printing of books for the blind. In 1922 the State of Kentucky appropriated a further fund of \$25,000 which was used in making a substantial addition to the existing structure, and altogether the State has expended between \$75,000 and \$100,000 in buildings and equipment, all of which is being used as a printing establishment for the blind of the United States agreeably to the act of 1879. Notwithstanding these plant expenditures made by the State of Kentucky, it does not receive any advantage whatsoever over the other States and Territories by reason thereof. The grounds and buildings are held and used by the American Printing House for the Blind for the benefit of all the States and Territories. Each State and Territory and the District of Columbia receive printed books and apparatus upon a quota basis; that is to say, each State or Territory or the District of Columbia receives such proportion of the total (in value) of books and apparatus annually produced in the American Printing House for the Blind as the total blind population maintained in the schools of each State or Territory or the District of Columbia may bear to the total blind population similarly maintained in all of the States, Territories, and District of Columbia.

The cost of building, equipping, and maintaining a separate plant of this character in each State and Territory for local needs would be prohibitive. A single plant, properly equipped and adequately financed, can reasonably care for the needs of the entire Nation. These considerations appear to have led to the enactment by Congress of the acts of 1879 and 1919. The same considerations yet obtain; but the increasing blind population in the schools of the country and the growing use of books for the blind and the increased cost of labor and supplies and the need for tangible apparatus for the blind—very little of which has been heretofore made because of a lack of funds therefor—make neces-

sary a further increase in these appropriations. The bill is intended to meet this situation.

No profit whatsoever is charged by the American Printing House for the Blind in the printing of these books and in the making of the required apparatus. The books and apparatus are furnished on the basis of their actual cost of production, so far as distribution is concerned, but without charge to the States and Territories, because the cost is cared for in the annual appropriations. For the purpose of fiscal administration, these institutions are placed by the act of 1879 under the supervision of the Treasury Department of the United States. Its accounts and expenditures are carefully watched and inspected by the Treasury Department, and in immediate charge of the institution there is a board of seven trustees, appointed agreeably to the terms of the Kentucky legislative act, creating as a corporation the American Printing House for the Blind. In addition, all of the superintendents of blind schools and like institutions in the United States and its Territories and the District of Columbia are ex officio members of the board of trustees and meet annually at the plant in Louisville, Ky., and there formulate the policies for the carrying on of the work involved. Annually the board of trustees makes to the Congress of the United States, the General Assembly of Kentucky, and to the governors of the States of the Union a detailed report of the operations of the institution, and annually reports are also made to the Secretary of the Treasury.

In the course of the hearings on the Craill bill some question was raised about something of profit having been made by the American Printing House for the Blind on a contract for books for the Veterans' Bureau. This contract was secured by the American Printing House under competitive bidding; the cost of this particular printing was borne by the Veterans' Bureau appropriations, just as is the cost of hospitalization and other items of that bureau, and no individual veteran bore any part of such printing cost. The printing at cost referred to in the quoted acts manifestly relates to the printing for the student blind in the schools of this country.

Some question was also raised about the use of the so-called profit on this contract. As already shown, the congressional act of 1879 does not permit the use of Federal appropriations for the erection or leasing of buildings; nor does that act permit any profit to be put on any books or tangible apparatus furnished for the blind pupils of the country. Yet it must be evident that new machinery and other equipment must be purchased from time to time, and improvements made, if the American Printing House for the Blind is to function adequately to meet the needs of the country's schools for the blind. The State of Kentucky, as already pointed out, has provided for this institution grounds, buildings, and equipment of the approximate present value of \$135,000. No other State in the Union, nor has the Federal Government, made any such contribution for these purposes. It would not be fair to the State of Kentucky to continue indefinitely to pay these particular capital costs, as the need therefor might arise. New machinery and equipment from time to time must be provided. Hence, the policy has been to do a certain amount of outside work—that is to say, work other than for the schools for the blind, wherever this could be done without detriment to the service for the schools for the blind; and for such outside work, usually to charge a fair profit. With the profits so derived necessary replacements and purchases of machinery have been made. These items could not have been taken care of in any other way; and the policy involved, I would submit is a wise and necessary one; and has never been questioned, so far as I am advised by Federal or State authorities charged with any duty or responsibility touching the subject. If these features were not thus taken care of, increased Federal appropriations would be necessary to meet them. By reason of these outside profits, the cost of books and apparatus during recent years has been reduced by 25 per cent. This result speaks for itself.

Again, these particular expenditures have resulted in decreasing the cost of books and apparatus for the blind children of the Nation, and has resulted in there being provided for them more books and better books and apparatus. Surely this is a most beneficent purpose to be served; and who may, with any justice, complain of it?

In passing I may suggest that the annual appropriations of \$75,000 a year, even under the favoring conditions of their expenditure, are insufficient for the purpose of supplying books and tangible apparatus for the needs of the blind children of America. These needs are constantly growing and the appropriations should be accordingly increased.

In truth, the American Printing House for the Blind exists only to serve the blind children of the Nation. It has no other purpose, no other function. Through all the years of its long

and successful career it has been a light to the Nation's youth of the unseeing world. To thousands of these, our beloved fellow beings, it has furnished the keys of knowledge. Its service has been of a value beyond estimation. Its customs, its policies, its practices, are all formulated and based on the highest considerations. If Federal aid were withdrawn, the institution would probably cease to exist; and the United States Government, at a much greater expense, would have to build and operate a distinct Federal plant to carry on this work; or otherwise provide the necessary books and apparatus; or each State and Territory would have to make its own arrangement in the premises. If the Federal Government had to set up and maintain its own plant to perform this work, the Federal costs would be tremendously increased. Because of this fact Congress has preferred to take advantage of the situation in the manner now obtaining.

In fact, the American Printing House for the Blind—to-day the largest printing house in the world for the blind—to all intents and purposes, is a Federal institution; it has functioned efficiently for more than 70 years; its active trustees, and its ex officio trustees, as well, have been American citizens of the highest standing; and this is eminently true to-day. The active trustees now in charge of the institution's affairs are among the most outstanding, unselfish, public-spirited citizens of the city of Louisville. They are performing their work without charge, and purely as a labor of love for a most noble cause. I know of no finer, nobler work than that which they are performing. They do not merit criticism. They have earned, and should receive, the commendation of all.

Since 1879 there have been annually submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury by the American Printing House for the Blind the fiscal reports and the documents required by the act of 1879. During all these years the accounts of the institution have been checked and audited; they have been accepted as correct by the Treasury Department, and in recent years, in addition to the regular audits at the hands of high-class certified public accountants, checks or audits of these expenditures have been made by the Comptroller General's office. The fact that throughout the nearly 75 years of the institution's history it has operated without graft or scandal constitutes a most striking and splendid commentary on the character of service it has rendered.

In the laudable purpose of securing legislation to take care of the needs of the adult blind I count it as being most unfortunate that among those actively working therefor there should be divisions or disagreement. I am sure that fine and effective work in behalf of our fellow beings in the unseeing world is being done by all the blind men and women advocating the respective bills now pending. The bill involved is too limited and the purposes to be served are too important and sacred to justify disagreement. If no agreement can be reached, it is to be hoped that Congress may exercise its best judgment and exercise it speedily, to the end that those of mature years in the sightless world may have the benefits and advantages now proposed but which have been so long delayed.

Since I am deeply interested in the whole subject of books for the blind, and ever since I have been a Member of the House, I have availed myself of every opportunity to aid in securing more and better books for the blind. This is true not only as regards increased appropriations for the blind pupils of the Nation but it is true also as regards advantages for the adult blind. Thus, during the present session, upon my motion and at my instance, the annual appropriation for the National Library for the Blind was increased from \$5,000 to \$6,500. This institution is located in Washington, D. C.; it is wholly distinct from the Library of Congress, but, like the Library of Congress, it lends to blind readers throughout the country books and publications printed in raised letters for the blind.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me therefor I now include as a portion of these remarks certain self-explanatory statements prepared for incorporation in the hearings before the House Committee on Education on the Crail bill. I may state that the Foundation for the Blind has no connection with the American Printing House for the Blind, and the statements before the House Committee on Education made by Robert B. Irwin, extension director of the foundation—some of which statements are hereafter quoted—are entitled to great weight in considering the work of the Louisville institution.

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. BARR, JR., PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

LOUISVILLE, KY., June 6, 1930.

To the HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,
United States Congress, Washington, D. C.:

On the 28th day of May last, in company with 8 or 10 trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind, representing various States

and acting in the capacity of superintendents of the various institutions for the education of the blind in the United States, we had the pleasure of addressing your committee—not in opposition to any bills pending but to answer any questions, adverse or otherwise, with reference to the operation of the American Printing House for the Blind.

For your information we wish to state that the American Printing House for the Blind was incorporated in January, 1858, by an act of the Kentucky Legislature. By a subsequent act passed June 3, 1865, it was provided by section 1, "That there shall be appropriated to the American Printing House for the Blind \$5 annually for every blind person in the State of Kentucky to aid the institution in printing books for the blind and in furnishing the same gratuitously to the indigent blind and at cost to others, in accordance with the provisions of the charter of the said Printing House for the Blind."

By an act of Congress approved March 3, 1879, it was provided that the sum of \$250,000 be appropriated and set apart as a perpetual fund for the purpose of aiding the education of the blind in the United States through the American Printing House for the Blind; and that the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to hold said sum in trust for the purpose mentioned and invest said sum in United States interest-bearing bonds bearing interest at 4 per cent; and that the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized to pay over to the trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind upon the requisition of their president countersigned by their treasurer the semiannual interest upon the said bonds upon the following conditions, namely: That such income be expended by the trustees each year in manufacturing and furnishing embossed books for the blind and tangible apparatus for their instruction, to be distributed each year among all the public institutions for the education of the blind in the States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia, upon the requisition of the superintendent of each, duly certified by its board of trustees, the basis for such distribution to be the total number of pupils in all the public institutions for the blind—each institution to receive in books and apparatus that portion of the total income of said bonds held by the Secretary of the Treasury in trust for the education of the blind, as is shown by the ratio between the number of pupils and that institution and the total number of pupils in all the public institutions for the education of the blind.

It is important to note that in paragraph 6 of clause 3 of the act above mentioned it is provided that the superintendents of the various public institutions for the education of the blind in the United States shall each, ex officio, be a member of the board of trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind; and in paragraph 3 of the same clause it is provided that no profit shall be put on any books or tangible apparatus for the instruction of the blind manufactured or furnished by the American Printing House for the Blind, and the price put upon each article so manufactured or furnished shall only be its actual cost.

By section 4 of this act it is provided that the trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind shall annually make to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States a report of the items of their expenditure of the income of said bonds during the year preceding their report, and shall annually furnish him with a voucher from each public institution for the education of the blind, showing that the amount of books and tangible apparatus due has been received.

By section 9 of the by-laws governing the American Printing House for the Blind, to be found on page 12 of the exhibit filed with this statement under the heading of Acts of Legislation Affecting the American Printing House for the Blind, it is provided that a committee on publication, composed of three trustees, shall be elected by the board of trustees, and that the American Printing House for the Blind shall print and manufacture such publications and apparatus as such committee may select and determine.

Your attention is called to an act of Congress dated June 25, 1906, and having reference to the maturity of the \$250,000 of bonds mentioned, and providing that in lieu of the reinvestment of such funds in Government bonds there be set aside and credited on the books of the Treasury Department the sum of \$10,000, being the equivalent of 4 per cent on such trust fund, such appropriation to be deemed a permanent annual appropriation and expended in the manner and for the purposes authorized by the act approved March 3, 1879.

Thus it will be seen that the United States Government has for a great many years pursued the policy of setting aside not less than \$10,000 annually for the education of the blind of the various States, through the American Printing House for the Blind, always with the provision that the sum so appropriated and expended should be reported to the Treasury Department of the United States and an acquittance given, and with the further provision that all books be furnished at actual cost. Our Government, for a period of more than 50 years, has made this appropriation, and it is clear, as provided in the acts above referred to, that it was intended the same should continue in a fixed appropriation of \$10,000 annually to provide perpetually for the purposes mentioned.

During the late war, or shortly thereafter, it became clearly apparent that due to growth of population the number of unfortunate blind children had increased greatly, making it necessary for an increased appropriation for the education of the blind. Thereupon, by acts of Congress

In 1919 and 1927, it was provided that for the purpose of enabling the American Printing House for the Blind to more adequately provide books for the blind, an additional \$65,000 be appropriated, making a total appropriation of \$75,000 annually to be used as provided in the original act for the benefit and education of the blind.

The Hon. M. H. THATCHER introduced the act of 1927 increasing the Federal authorizations from \$50,000 to \$75,000 annually; and there has never been any question as to the proper expenditure of the money, with the approval of the Treasury Department of the reports furnished, and satisfying the Secretary of the Treasury that the books published were disposed of at actual cost and not otherwise.

Attached to this statement is a copy of the sixty-first report of the trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind. Your attention is especially called to page 9 of this report, setting forth the distribution of the \$75,000, with the proper appropriation to each State. Your attention is also called, on page 12 of the same publication, to the abstract showing the disbursements made of the Government account. It is true that the American Printing House for the Blind has in addition to the Government account a general account, but the items of the two accounts are kept entirely separate and distinct. In this connection we may say that each State in the Union receives, in addition to its quota, all books for the blind at actual cost, and while other publications are made such publications bring down the cost of operation and produces a lower cost of books than would be possible, were not some outside business done.

The report of the trustees of the printing house above referred to shows the large number of books which the unfortunate blind are enabled to secure through the American Printing House for the Blind; and all such books are carefully selected by superintendents of institutions for the education of the blind, so that the unfortunate blind children may have some of the pleasure and education of the more fortunate children who are not blind.

We are filing with this statement a letter from Meldrum & Meldrum, certified public accountants, of long and intimate connection with the affairs of the American Printing House for the Blind. From this statement of the accountants it is quite clear that the moneys appropriated by the Government for the education of the blind are used by the printing house absolutely as provided in the act of Congress making the funds available.

The State of Kentucky originally furnished six and a fraction acres of land and made provision for the erection of the building for the American Printing House for the Blind, and by subsequent legislation five or six years ago, about the time it became apparent that the number of blind children had greatly increased, appropriated an additional sum of \$25,000 for the improvement of the building.

The State of Kentucky and its blind receive no greater benefits from the American Printing House for the Blind than do other States. They are all on exactly the same footing.

The charge has been made that \$30,000 profit was received through the contract of the American Printing House with the Veterans' Bureau. As to whether \$30,000 profit was made on this contract I think there is considerable doubt, but be that as it may, and assuming that for the purpose of this statement such a profit was made, it will be noted from the statement of Meldrum & Meldrum that such sum was used in making up a deficit created in selling books to blind children, not at cost, as provided in the act of appropriation, but at lower than the cost of manufacture. In this connection, permit us to say that the contract referred to was let under competitive bidding and the award was made to the printing house for the reason that their bid was lower.

We take pleasure in stating, and we believe that the evidence will sustain us, that the American Printing House for the Blind has never made any distribution of profits in the form of dividends or otherwise to any person or persons. Furthermore, all purchases are made under competitive bidding, and the materials bought and the prices paid are in keeping in every way with the act of Congress referred to.

The writer of this report begs to again state that at the hearing in Washington he was not sufficiently informed as to the technical operation of the plant of the American Printing House for the Blind, but his associates, who were present at that hearing, were able, I believe, to answer every question propounded.

We appeared at the hearing for the reason that we understood some questions had been raised as to the extravagance of operation of the printing house. We did not then, nor do we now ask that the Government curtail in any way its assistance to the unfortunate blind, whether adults or children. We believe that the Government can well afford to give not only to other institutions but likewise to the American Printing House for the Blind larger appropriations.

In conclusion, we again insist that the Printing House for the Blind is not a private institution; it makes no profit; and all of the funds appropriated by the Government are accounted for in detail. Up to the present time, covering a period of more than 50 years, there has never been any question as to honesty of expenditures or economy of operation. All funds received from the Government are reported to and receive the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Thus we are a Government industry, and we feel that the records are such as to leave no doubt that the accounting of 50 years past will not in any

way affect the future appropriations for the unfortunate blind children of this country.

Should the members of this committee feel that we have not answered all questions fully and with the greatest frankness, we shall be pleased not only to furnish any further information required but to send any employees of the institution and likewise the accountants to Washington.

It is not inappropriate to state that to the best of my knowledge every superintendent of a public institution for the blind in the 48 States is in accord with and approves of every action of the American Printing House for the Blind. The fact is that the superintendents representing the various institutions of the country are in reality, not only by reason of their numbers but more especially because of their acquaintance with the needs of the blind, the dominant factor in the government of the printing house.

Since 1906 we are indebted to every Congressman for their approval of our acts, and especially of latter years, to the Hon. Swager Sherley and subsequently to the Hon. MAURICE H. THATCHER, who have so faithfully served the cause of the blind children in every State of the Union.

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND,
By JNO. W. BARR, Jr., *President*.

STATEMENT OF MELDRUM & MELDRUM, CERTIFIED ACCOUNTANTS

[Meldrum & Meldrum, certified public accountants, members American Institute of Accountants, suite 403-5 Hilliard Building, 419 West Jefferson Street, Louisville, Ky. Overton S. Meldrum, C. P. A. George F. Meldrum, C. P. A.]

JUNE 5, 1930.

Mr. JOHN W. BARR,

*President American Printing House for the Blind,
Louisville, Ky.*

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to conference with you Tuesday afternoon, June 3, at which time you submitted to the writer a letter dated May 30, of Superintendent George S. Wilson, of the Indiana School for the Blind, Indianapolis, Ind., and a letter dated May 31, of O. H. Burritt, principal of the Pennsylvania Institution for the Instruction of the Blind, Overbrook, Philadelphia, Pa., requesting certain data relative to the operations of the American Printing House for the Blind for presentation to the House Committee on Education.

Permit us to say that, due to our engagements and the little time allotted us by you, we can not make reply in detail to the various questions propounded by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Burritt, yet we will endeavor to present such facts as we believe will meet with their requirements.

We were employed, by resolution of the board of trustees at a meeting held June 23, 1913, to make an investigation of the American Printing House for the Blind for the purpose of installing a comprehensive system of accounting adequate to the demands of the business. The system was installed as of July 1, 1913, and has been in operation from that date and we have had supervisory charge of the work and prosecuted annual audits, making annual reports and settlements with the Treasury Department of the United States, and on numerous occasions the writer visited Washington and had conferences with representatives of the department, resulting in acceptance of all of our reports as being satisfactory and meeting the requirements.

In answer to Mr. Wilson's query as to the method, in detail, at which we arrive at the cost of the books furnished to the States under their quotas, we may say that a detail cost system is not employed. It must be understood that the operating of a printing house for the blind is a separate and distinct project, entirely different from any other publishing company. To attempt a detail cost, we consider impracticable and if it were possible, the cost would be prohibitive. The general ledger operating accounts evidence the production costs representing all material, labor, and manufacturing expenses, administrative and general expenses covering executive and office salaries, printing and general expenses attached to administration and, further, depreciation on stereograph plates. We may say further that all materials and supplies are purchased through competitive bidding.

No depreciation on buildings, machinery, or equipment is applied to or is a part of cost of production.

In answer to questions submitted by Mr. Burritt.

(1) Ownership of the land and buildings of the American Printing House for the Blind is vested in the Kentucky Board of Trustees for the American Printing House for the Blind. The land represents 6.8 acres, more or less, on Frankfort Avenue and State Street, running north to Brownsboro Road, as per deed on file in the safe at the American Printing House, which cost \$9,500. Let us state most emphatically that not one cent of the appropriations by the Government of the United States has ever been expended for real estate or buildings; (2) as to the moral and legal right of the American Printing House for the Blind to "publish books for the Veterans' Bureau at a profit, in view of the fact that the law making the appropriations specifically

states that the printing house is not an organization for profit and that books shall be supplied to the schools for the blind at cost"; and (3) "to expend its profit of \$30,000 on the contract with the Veterans' Bureau upon buildings," permit us to say that we are not aware of where or how the \$30,000 referred to was obtained.

The American Printing House for the Blind in providing reading matter and tangible apparatus for the blind, because of their handicap, endeavors to operate at no profit, and while the operating results for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1914, 1915, 1917, 1921, and 1922, evidence a total net gain of \$4,271.82 for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1916, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1923, and 1924 (during which period the change to revised Braille was made), the operating results evidence a total net loss of \$41,223.55, with a resultant deficit of \$36,951.73 for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1914 to 1924, inclusive. During the fiscal years ended June 30, 1925, 1926, and 1927, through the acquisition and execution of a contract with the Veterans' Bureau involving large volume and consequent full day and extra night and Sunday work with resultant production economy, the operating results evidence a total net gain of \$38,706.94 whereby the entire deficit as of June 30, 1924, of \$36,951.73 was overcome and an accrued net gain of \$1,755.21 realized as of June 30, 1927. Having overcome the deficit and anticipating production economies which would result from increased volume of business through the Government subsidy increase to \$75,000 per annum, the management reduced the prices on publications 25 per cent, and during the fiscal years ended June 30, 1928 and 1929, the operating results evidence a total net gain of \$1,146.57, which amount, added to the accrued net gain as of June 30, 1927, of \$1,755.21 produces a total accrued operating net gain of \$2,901.78 for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1914 to 1929, inclusive, a period of 10 years, or an average nominal net gain of \$181.36 per year, which is conclusive evidence that the Government beneficiaries have received their respective quotas of publications and tangible apparatus during the said 16-year period at as nearly cost as could be ascertained, year in and year out.

In July, 1927, it was found that the catalogue prices of the publications could be reduced, and a 25 per cent reduction was made at that time and has been operative since.

In 1918 a change was made from New York Point and American Braille to Revised Braille. This change necessarily junked all of the plates of New York Point and American Braille. The plates were sold as scrap, and the amount realized credited to plate account and the resultant loss charged to capital account and not to operating expenses.

In 1923 the State of Kentucky appropriated \$25,000 for additions to the buildings of the printing house, and this appropriation was applied for that purpose.

We want to bring to your attention and impress upon you the fact that the American Printing House for the Blind is not in business for profit. The affairs of the printing house are under the jurisdiction of the board of trustees, all gentlemen of the highest standing and integrity, business men, financial men, and superintendents of the institutions. This board give their services gratuitously—not one cent is charged for their valuable services nor applied to the cost of production.

It has been our pleasure to serve this organization in the capacity herebefore stated and in rendering this service our aim has been to protect and give to those who, in God's wise providence, have been deprived of their vision the benefit of every dollar in worth of the appropriation by the Government that would materialize from the publications in the blind print, and we believe that they have been benefited to the full extent and that none of the funds have been misapplied.

Respectfully,

MELDRUM & MELDRUM,
Certified Public Accountants, Members
American Institute of Accountants.

EXTRACTS FROM STATEMENT OF ROBERT B. IRWIN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND (OF WHICH HON. CALVIN COOLIDGE IS HONORARY PRESIDENT)

Now, as to the American Printing House for the Blind, which received rather rough treatment at the hearing. For many years educators of the blind endeavored to get an appropriation from the Government for school books. After repeated failures a bill was finally passed in 1879 which appropriated \$10,000 a year for this purpose. At that time the Government was not prepared to establish a Government printing plant for the blind. The next best thing seemed to be an annual grant to the American Printing House for the Blind at Louisville, Ky., under two conditions: (1) That they make the superintendent of each State school for the blind an ex officio member of its board; and (2) that \$10,000 worth of books be distributed among the schools for the blind of the country each year. This grant was not increased for 40 years. During most of this time this money was divided between the publication of books in two embossed types requiring entirely different machinery for their production. Had it not been for the generosity of the State of Kentucky, which provided the building and much of the machinery, far less could have been accomplished with this \$10,000 grant than has been the case.

Much was said at the hearing of the profit made on the books sold to the Veterans' Bureau. Those who were stressing this point, however, did not indicate that this profit was realized on a price below the competitive bid made by the Universal Braille Press, of Los Angeles; nor has anyone claimed that the Government paid a higher unit cost for its school books that year than would have been the case had it not received the Veterans' Bureau business. When the American Printing House for the Blind had completed its job and realized the profit referred to, it was confronted with two alternatives—either to refund the money to the Government or to invest it in much needed equipment. Since there was no understanding with the Government that this particular job should be done on a cost basis, it was decided to invest the profit in much needed plant equipment designed to increase the efficiency of the concern. Increased efficiency in this particular case meant that the Government's annual allowance would buy more and better school books for the blind children of the country.

By the way, it was intimated at the hearing that the profit on the Veterans' Bureau books amounted to about \$30,000. I have searched the published records of the printing house and find no indication of just what profit was made. The acting manager of the printing house writes me that \$30,000 is a gross exaggeration and that an accurate statement has been sent your committee by the printing-house auditors. (See attached extract from American Printing House report.)

At the hearing the fact was brought out that prices of books sold by the American Printing House for the Blind have been reduced a great deal during the past 10 years, and the implication was that it was due to the competition of the Universal Braille Press. As a matter of fact, about the time the Universal Braille Press was established a universal Braille system was adopted in this country so that the American Printing House for the Blind could concentrate its efforts upon publishing in one code instead of two. About the same time also the Government increased its allowance to the American Printing House from \$10,000 to \$50,000, thus enabling it to operate in a much more economical fashion. Furthermore, the cost of paper and many other materials has fallen off very markedly during the past decade.

Printing for the blind can not be fairly compared with other kinds of printing. It never has been, and probably never can be made, a commercial success. This is due to the extremely limited market and to the high cost of production. It is difficult to see the force of the contention that the Government should appropriate to the Braille Institute of America \$100,000 annually, because its manager has found, like every other person either in the United States or Europe who has tried the experiment, that a printing plant for the blind can not be run without public or private subsidy.

REGARDING PROFIT ON VETERANS' BUREAU BOOKS

[Extract from fifty-eighth report of the board of trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind (Inc.) for the year ending June 30, 1926, p. 14]

The business of this institution has been carried on in two distinct departments.

First. Under the appropriation by which are furnished free books to the schools in proportion to their attendance, to the amount of \$50,000.

Second. General business beyond and outside of the printing of books for the schools in accordance with preceding paragraph; for example, blinded soldiers, the contract with the American Bible Society, and other small contracts to print books for individuals and sales to other than Government beneficiary institutions.

In reviewing the business for the past four years the transactions under paragraph 2 have greatly increased, especially during the year 1924-25, when the large contract for the Veterans' Bureau was filled, evidencing a substantial profit. In view of the results emanating from the increased business referred to in paragraph 2, it was found possible to make a reduction of 25 per cent during the current year on all Braille books furnished the Government beneficiary institutions, and we may say that conditions look favorable for a further possible reduction in the cost of books to the institutions during the approaching year, which evidences the benefits derived by the institution from the increase in the general business.

STATEMENT CONTAINED IN SIXTY-FIRST REPORT OF AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND, YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1929, SHOWING DISTRIBUTION OF BOOKS AND APPARATUS

States having institutions for the blind

	Number of pupils	Amount of quota
Alabama School for the Blind.....	127	\$1,593.88
Alabama School for the Negro Deaf and Blind.....	30	376.51
Arizona School for the Blind.....	17	213.35
Arkansas School for the Blind.....	130	1,631.53
Atlanta School for the Blind.....	7	87.85
Buffalo Board of Education, department for blind.....	5	62.75
California School for the Blind.....	110	1,380.52
Chestnut Street School, class for the blind, Johnstown, Pa.....	22	276.10
Chicago public schools, department for the blind.....	65	815.76

STATEMENT CONTAINED IN SIXTY-FIRST REPORT OF AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND, YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1929, SHOWING DISTRIBUTION OF BOOKS AND APPARATUS—Continued

States having institutions for the blind—Continued

	Number of pupils	Amount of quota
Cincinnati public schools, department for the blind.....	11	\$138.05
Cleveland public schools, department for the blind.....	36	451.81
Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind.....	73	916.16
Connecticut School for the Blind.....	61	765.56
Connecticut Nursery for the Blind.....	4	50.21
Detroit public schools, department for the blind.....	20	376.51
Duluth public schools, department for the blind.....	3	37.65
Florida School for the Blind, Deaf, and Dumb.....	54	677.71
Georgia Academy for the Blind.....	117	1,468.37
Idaho School for the Deaf and Blind.....	26	326.31
Illinois School for the Blind.....	235	2,949.30
Indiana School for the Blind.....	144	1,807.23
Iowa College for the Blind.....	146	1,832.33
Jersey City public schools, department for the blind.....	9	112.95
Kansas School for the Education of the Blind.....	126	1,581.33
Kentucky School for the Blind.....	112	1,405.62
Los Angeles public schools, department for the blind.....	39	489.46
Louisiana Institution for the Blind.....	76	953.82
Louisiana School for the Blind (colored).....	31	389.06
Maryland School for the Blind.....	110	1,380.52
Massachusetts School and Perkins Institution for the Blind.....	264	3,313.25
Michigan Employment Institution for the Blind.....	75	941.27
Michigan School for the Blind.....	177	2,221.39
Milwaukee public schools, department for the blind.....	12	150.60
Minnesota School for the Blind.....	124	1,556.22
Minneapolis public schools, department for the blind.....	27	338.86
Mississippi Institution for the Blind.....	75	941.27
Missouri School for the Blind.....	109	1,367.97
Montana School for the Deaf and Blind.....	22	276.10
Nebraska School for the Blind.....	65	815.76
Newark public schools, department for the blind.....	23	288.65
New Mexico Institution for the Blind.....	83	1,041.67
New Orleans public schools, department for the blind.....	8	100.40
New York Institute for the Blind.....	131	1,644.08
New York State School for the Blind.....	174	2,183.73
New York City public schools, department for the blind.....	98	1,229.92
North Carolina School for the Deaf and Blind.....	227	2,848.90
North Dakota School for the Blind.....	40	502.01
Ohio State School for the Blind.....	240	3,012.05
Oklahoma School for the Blind.....	131	1,644.08
Oklahoma School for the Deaf and Blind.....	9	112.95
Oregon Institute for the Blind.....	50	627.51
Oregon Employment Institute for the Blind.....	62	778.11
Pennsylvania Institution for the Blind.....	287	3,601.91
Patterson School for the Blind.....	14	175.70
Royer-Greaves School for the Blind.....	17	213.35
Seattle Public School for the Blind.....	3	37.65
South Carolina School for the Deaf and Blind.....	111	1,393.07
South Dakota School for the Blind.....	35	439.26
Tennessee School for the Blind.....	231	2,899.10
Texas School for the Blind.....	245	3,074.80
Texas Institution for the Deaf and Blind (colored).....	97	1,217.37
Toledo public schools, department for the blind.....	7	87.85
Utah School for the Blind.....	33	414.15
Virginia School for the Deaf and Blind.....	77	966.36
Virginia School for the Colored Deaf and Blind.....	26	326.30
Washington School for the Blind.....	82	1,029.12
Western Pennsylvania Institution for the Blind.....	154	1,932.73
West Virginia schools for the deaf and blind.....	110	1,380.52
West Virginia School for the Blind (colored).....	20	251.00
Wisconsin School for the Blind.....	234	2,936.75
Youngstown Board of Education, department for blind.....	11	138.05
	5,976	75,000.00

Per capita, \$12.5502.

A BANKING EPISODE IN TARPON SPRINGS, FLA.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on a certain banking situation in Florida. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I desire to explain that the little city of Tarpon Springs, Fla., is the largest sponge market in the world outside the Mediterranean. Recovering sponges from the sea and preparing them for market is the principal industry. Her people are largely composed of "Those who go down to the sea in ships and have their business in great waters."

They have a small national bank there, and a few days ago the officials of the bank, seeing trouble ahead, took the people into their confidence, called a number of the leading depositors into a mass meeting, and explained that on account of existing financial conditions, combined with excitement incident thereto, the bank would not be open for business on the following morning unless the people themselves should take such action as reason and civic pride should dictate; that the bank was not the property of the bank officials, nor even the property of the stockholders, but in the last analysis was the property of the depositors themselves. What followed is graphically told by the Tarpon Springs Leader, the principal newspaper of the little city.

It is an example of common sense and civic pride unusual in these days of financial panic, and for this reason I have asked permission to insert it in the Record. It contains a "moral to adorn the tale."

SILENT BANK RUN IS STOPPED HERE WHEN DEPOSITORS ORGANIZE—SEVENTY-FIVE DEPOSITORS TAKE UP \$400,000 WORTH OF COLLATERAL

Pledging deposits and purchasing securities, 75 depositors of the First National Bank of Commerce, representing nearly 80 per cent of the total deposits of the bank, at a meeting held Wednesday night at the Sunset Hills Hotel, took over about \$400,000 in mortgages and municipal bonds which the bank had been unable to turn into cash.

The meeting was called at the suggestion of Edgar J. Phillips, a director of the bank. It included only the larger depositors and the stockholders. As they sat on the huge veranda of the clubhouse, with only the full moon furnishing the light, they were told that the bank would be unable to open for business on Thursday morning due to heavy withdrawals during the past four weeks. These withdrawals, totaling \$150,000, were rapidly diminishing the cash on hand.

There were brief discussions with plans advanced and then every person present signed an agreement, assigning their deposits to the bank and promising not to withdraw their money, but to take real-estate mortgages and Florida municipal bonds in exchange.

This action, the directors state, put the bank in better shape than was expected and will enable it to pay the other depositors, should they demand it, dollar for dollar. The bank's deposits total \$600,000. The loyal depositors came to the rescue just as the bank officials had decided not to open the bank Thursday morning.

One man in the meeting gave the bank \$1,300 for a \$1,000 Hernando County security which the bank had been unable to sell. Other generous acts were done by business men, J. C. McCrocklin, president of the institution, stating that one man took five diamonds from his safety deposit box and offered them to the bank for whatever assistance they would give. Practically all of the paper which the bank was unable to dispose of was taken by these depositors, Mr. McCrocklin states.

Then a committee of 12 was appointed to be at the bank at opening time Thursday morning and challenge all who went to withdraw their accounts. The Leader commercial plant began printing at 5.30 a. m. and before Tarponites appeared on the street the committee had huge placards hung in store windows, inscribed, "We believe in our bank"; cars were decorated with these signs, and as storekeepers appeared and heard the news, flags were brought out, and soon the city had a gala holiday appearance.

As the bank opened depositors appeared and were decorated with orange-colored tags inscribed "Line up with the depositors." And they did. Only four withdrawals, other than the usual small ones for change, were reported, while all day a queue worked its way up to the receiving tellers' wickets and deposits were poured onto the bank counters.

The middle of the morning Grella and his band, of Clearwater, appeared, and despite a drizzling rain paraded the streets of the city. The day was declared a holiday—"confidence day"—by Mayor J. N. Craig, and outside of the deposits being made at the bank very little business was attempted.

President McCrocklin and Mr. Phillips were high in their praise for the people of the city and surrounding towns, and said that if such enthusiasm and optimism prevailed in other Florida towns their banking troubles would be solved. They also pointed out that other Florida towns could use the Tarpon Springs plan and protect their institutions.

At the close of business yesterday—and the bank did not close at its regular time at noon, Thursday being a half holiday—but remained open until 2 o'clock to give everyone a chance to withdraw their money if they so desired—Mr. McCrocklin stated that deposits totaled more than 350, with only 4 withdrawals, and that the cash in the bank had been greatly augmented during the day.

All day long-distance telephone calls brought expressions of congratulations from Florida's leading citizens, while the telegraph wires brought them from other States.

This morning President McCrocklin announced that the officers and employees of the bank had each donated one month's salary to the bank.

The spirit of optimism is apparent everywhere in town to-day, and a new chapter in Florida banking history is being written.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on veterans' legislation and constitutional amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, I introduced House Joint Resolution 348, which has for its purpose the proposal of a constitutional amendment which will give the people

of the various States the right to submit and ratify amendments to the Federal Constitution.

The resolution reads as follows:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for ratification of proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States by the people of the several States.

Resolved, etc., That an amendment is hereby proposed to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States. Said amendment shall be as follows:

ARTICLE —

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified by the people of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress: *Provided*, That ratification by the people of the several States shall be in accordance to the method prescribed in the respective State constitution for the adoption of amendments to such State constitution."

The fifth article of the Constitution of the United States provides two methods for proposing and ratifying amendments to the Constitution. In the first instance, the Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to the Constitution for ratification by the State legislatures. In the second instance, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, the Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments.

The fifth article likewise proposes two methods for the ratification of the proposed amendments. The first method, and the only one which has been thus far used in the adoption of 19 amendments, provides for ratification by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States. The other untried method provides for ratification by conventions in three-fourths of the States.

In the ratification of amendments by the legislatures of the various States, the theory of our representative form of government, contemplates that the members of the State legislatures are elected upon the issues proposed in the amendments, and that when such duly elected representatives cast their vote for or against a proposed amendment, they express the will of their constituents. Theoretically, this idea is correct, but practical experience demonstrates that members of the State legislatures are elected by political combinations and friends, and not upon issues found in amendments to the Federal Constitution.

About 18 years ago, Article XII of the Constitution was adopted by the legislatures of the various States. This amendment gave the right to the people to elect Senators to the United States Senate, and took that power away from the State legislatures. My resolution is in harmony with the twelfth article and confers directly the obligation and right upon the people to vote on all future amendments to the Federal Constitution.

My resolution is in conformity with the general practice used in all States for ratification of amendments to the various State constitutions. The voters, themselves, determine as to whether or not an amendment shall be adopted to a State constitution.

My purpose in calling this resolution to your attention at this time is to give the Members of the House an opportunity to study the question during the summer recess, and be in a position to discuss the resolution when it comes up for consideration before the Judiciary Committee of the House and upon the floor. I will ask the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings upon the resolution when Congress reconvenes.

The people should have the right to vote on constitutional questions, and I feel sure that the rank and file of our intelligent electorate will welcome the responsibility of passing upon amendments to the Federal Constitution in the same manner as they now assume the responsibility in regard to amendments to their respective State constitutions.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, preparations are going forward for the adjournment of Congress, and I am sure that all of the Members are anxiously awaiting the time for return to their respective homes. Much important legislation has been considered, but there still re-

mains a very vital matter which must have the favorable consideration by Congress and the President before we depart.

I refer to veterans' legislation. We passed the Johnson bill in the House by a large majority. The purpose of this bill is to take care of the thousands of disabled veterans who have been denied justice at the hands of the Veterans' Bureau and Congress. These poor, unfortunate, and disabled veterans are entitled to every consideration at the hands of Congress, and we should not adjourn until such legislation has been enacted into law.

During the past six years I have assisted in the presentation of hundreds of cases before the boards in the Veterans' Bureau. Many of these have resulted in favorable decisions, but it has always been just another fight with the officials in the bureau to secure recognition for the disabled veteran. Scores of meritorious cases have been turned down for me and for other Members of the Congress by the boards in the bureau, and I often wonder as to the reason for their seemingly arbitrary attitude. The people of the country certainly want the disabled veterans taken care of, and I know that the Members of Congress are doing everything possible in aiding these men with their claims. So, what is the matter and where is the trouble?

There must be something radically wrong with the system of the Veterans' Bureau, and therefore no time should be lost in making proper correction by the enactment of the pending legislation so that these deserving disabled veterans will be taken care of.

Certainly it has always been the intention of Congress to properly take care of the country's disabled soldiers, the widows of deceased veterans, and their minor children. I am sure that if the Veterans' Bureau would apply the actual intention of Congress to existing legislation we would not be faced with the present difficulties.

There are thousands and thousands of deserving cases pending before the Veterans' Bureau which have not been service connected. These cases should be taken care of, and, in my opinion, the only way they will be taken care of at this time will be either to extend the presumptive period up to January 1, 1930, or pass regular pension legislation along the lines of H. R. 5614, which was introduced by me in December. The passage of a general pension bill for disabled veterans when no service connection can be shown will not only take care of the veterans but will also take care of widows and minor children, similarly to the act approved in 1924 for the Spanish-American War veterans.

The rate of pension provided for in H. R. 5614 would depend upon the degree of disability within a range of from \$10 to \$50 per month. A widow of a deceased veteran would receive \$30 per month during her widowhood, and each minor child under the age of 16 years would receive \$6 per month. The passage of a general pension law, as I have proposed it, would in no way interfere with rating or compensation for service-connected cases under existing law.

The enactment of the so-called Johnson bill with the Rankin amendment, which is now up for consideration, will go far in taking care of thousands of disabled veterans who have heretofore not been able to secure recognition. Our only opportunity will be to pass this legislation, and it should be approved at once.

My criticism against the Veterans' Bureau is not directed against the rank and file of the employees in the bureau, as I frankly admit that the regional directors and their rating boards have tried to aid in every way possible in helping the disabled veterans within the narrow limits of the thousands of regulations and orders issued from the central office. My criticism is not directed at Gen. Frank Hines, the director, as he is most sympathetic, and the Members of the House know from experience that he will do his utmost to help the disabled veteran. We can not expect him, however, to sit down and pass upon several hundred thousand cases. It would not be humanly possible.

I do, however, criticize the policy of that small inner group of about eight men in the central office of the bureau, who are in direct charge of interpreting veterans' legislation and in the issuance of orders and regulations. This group never comes into contact with the disabled veteran, and as a consequence they know nothing about the "milk of human kindness" or the meaning of the term "benefit of the doubt." They are "hard boiled," and it appears that they have but one motive in life and that is to perfect regulations and orders which will prevent disabled veterans from receiving proper recognition. They have fixed as a definite policy that they would rather spend \$100,000 of public money in fighting a veteran's just claim rather than to pay a few paltry dollars per month for a disability. They compel disabled veterans to seek relief against the Government

through the courts, and, thank God, the courts and juries have found in favor of the veterans in a large preponderance of the litigated cases.

Congress would do well to make a thorough investigation of the bureau and then start a house cleaning wherever facts disclosed the necessity for such action. If the investigation discloses that the bureau properly interprets the law and administers it, then the bureau officials will be exonerated and Congress should pass additional laws to correct existing evils.

Let us do justice by the thousands of disabled veterans who have been unable to secure service connection by approving a law now which will take care of them beyond all reasonable doubt.

RELIEF OF THE STATE OF MAINE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8583) for the relief of the State of Maine.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill requires three objections. One objection is heard.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have had difficulty in reconciling myself to this bill. If this applies only to the State of Maine—

Mr. BEEDY. If the gentleman will read the bill he will see it goes equally by its terms to the city of Portsmouth, N. H., but in the writing of the title the city of Portsmouth, N. H., was not included.

Mr. HALE. The bill is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the bill extends the privileges to the city of Portsmouth, N. H., I shall not object.

Mr. HALE. It does.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman from Maine yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is a balance of \$34,773.11 in the account, and because there is that account the bill is before us to divide it between the State of Maine and the city of Portsmouth.

Mr. BEEDY. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill requires three objections. The Chair hears two objections. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount equal to the unexpended balance of appropriations made by Congress to aid in the construction of a bridge between Kittery, Me., and Portsmouth, N. H., remaining unexpended upon final settlement of contracts made by the United States for the construction of such bridge, one-half to the State of Maine and one-half to the city of Portsmouth, N. H., but the total payments under this act shall not exceed \$35,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause down to and including line 4, on page 2, and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$34,773.11, the sum being the unexpended balance of an appropriation heretofore made by Congress to aid in the construction of a bridge between Kittery, Me., and Portsmouth, N. H., one-half to be paid to the State of Maine and the other half to the city of Portsmouth, N. H."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, the title should be amended by adding the words "and the city of Portsmouth, N. H."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the title will be so amended.

There was no objection.

COMMEMORATION OF CERTAIN MILITARY HISTORIC EVENTS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11489) to provide for the commemoration of certain military historic events, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SURVEY OF THE SALMON RIVER, ALASKA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12121) to provide for a survey of the Salmon River, Alaska, with a view to the prevention and control of its floods.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of the Salmon River, Alaska, with a view to preparing plans and estimates of the cost of such work as may be necessary for the prevention and control of its floods in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1917, and the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, contained in House Document No. 346, Seventy-first Congress, second session; and the sum of \$800 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC RESOLUTION NO. 80, SEVENTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the resolution (H. J. Res. 303) to amend Public Resolution No. 80, Seventieth Congress, second session, relating to payment of certain claims of grain elevators and grain firms.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have taken this matter up with the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SINCLAIR], and in order that this matter may not come back to us, and to make certain that these claims will be adjusted on the reports now in the possession of the Government and filed during the year 1919-20, I have suggested an amendment, on page 2, line 3, "made and filed during the year 1919-20 with the Grain Corporation," so that it will be clear that these awards will be made on the evidence which was filed at that time and not made up since then. With this understanding I shall not object.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, certainly this bill ought to be amended if it is going to go through. The phraseology ought to be corrected and the words "approved February 4, 1929," ought to be inserted after the words "No. 80" in line 3. The report does not comply with the Ramseyer rule.

Mr. HALL of North Dakota. If the gentleman will submit his amendment I will agree to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I do not see wherein the report complies with the Ramseyer rule so that we know exactly what is proposed by the amendment of existing law.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can tell the gentleman. The proviso is new.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think we should have this bill comply with the rule, and I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the report does not comply with the Ramseyer rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman state what part of the bill he has reference to?

Mr. STAFFORD. The report does not show wherein the bill is an amendment of existing law.

The resolution before the House seeks to amend a certain resolution heretofore passed. That resolution is not incorporated in the report. There is nothing on the face of the bill or in the report that gives the information necessary for the House to intelligently consider this proposed resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It seems to the present occupant of the chair that the resolution is simply amending the other resolution by adding something thereto and is not striking out anything from existing law. I do not see just how you could otherwise comply with the Ramseyer rule.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the House is entitled to know what is proposed to be amended. The resolution provides for adding certain language. The purpose of the Ramseyer rule is to give the House information so that it can intelligently pass upon any proposed change of existing law. The proviso may be in direct conflict with existing law.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the Chair will permit, I want to say I have guarded the Ramseyer rule as much as any Member of this House, and I have repeatedly made points of order where

reports came in that did not comply with the very wise and necessary provisions of that rule, but in this case it seems to me the bill in itself is explanatory of what it does, because it simply adds a proviso, and the proviso, of course, is contained in the bill.

Mr. COLLINS. But the proviso may be in conflict with existing law.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course.

Mr. COLLINS. And in that event, it would be in conflict with the rule.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the proviso speaks for itself.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the only purpose of the Ramseyer rule is to require a committee to bring to the attention of the House what the proposed change of law is, and the committee in the bill itself brings that information to the House, and hence there is not the same necessity for the report containing the information.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman from Michigan will permit, I direct the Speaker's attention to the second clause of the Ramseyer rule. There are two provisions of the rule:

(1) The text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and

(2) A comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed to be made.

The House has nothing before it to intelligently pass upon what is proposed to be amended. There is the express provision, but we can not tell by this amendment, unless we seek the original law, what is the extent of this amendment.

Mr. COLLINS. It may be in the teeth of existing law.

Mr. STAFFORD. It may be directly antipodal of existing law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is ready to rule.

Under a strict application of paragraph 2a, Rule XIII, the Chair thinks the immediate section of law preceding the proposed amendment should have been printed in the report.

The point of order is sustained and the bill is recommitted to the Committee on War Claims.

MONUMENTS TO MARK BIRTHPLACE OF DECEASED PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11582) to provide monuments to mark the birthplaces of deceased Presidents of the United States.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I object.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I object.

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, I have suggested amendments which, I understand, are agreeable to those in charge of the bill. It provides that this shall be done through the National Park Service, and provides for maintenance and also provides for the expense of preliminary investigations out of the regular appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, as there are so many amendments to be offered I will object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three objections are heard, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

UNITED STATES MASSACHUSETTS BAY COLONY TERCENTENARY COMMISSION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I do not see why section 2 of the resolution is necessary in the face of the report. Section 2 authorizes the appropriation of \$10,000, and, as I understand it, there will be no expense to the Government.

Mr. LUCE. The gentleman misinterprets that report. It was intended to bring out this fact, that there was no desire in this instance, as there was in the case of the Plymouth celebration, for any construction. This provides for the ordinary expenses of the commission. When the commission is made up of the Members of the House and the Senate they are paid out of the contingent fund of the House. It has been the custom in more important celebrations, where members are also appointed by the President to have an appropriation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the President usually appoint local persons?

Mr. LUCE. He did not so do in the case of Yorktown.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How many commissioners are there?

Mr. LUCE. Fifteen; 5 to be appointed by the President of the United States, 5 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 5 Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker of the House.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And it is proposed to expend \$10,000.

Mr. LUCE. I do not think it will amount to that, but the State of Massachusetts is having a series of celebrations which are now in progress and will last probably until snow flies. These commissioners may have to stay in the State several days and if so it will be difficult to estimate the exact amount, but it will not exceed \$10,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Once the commissioners cross the borders of the State line they will be the guests of the State, with the typical New England hospitality, I am sure.

Mr. LUCE. I have no doubt that hospitality will be extended to them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Massachusetts Bay Colony Tercentenary Commission (hereinafter referred to as the commission) and to be composed of 15 commissioners, as follows: 5 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, 5 Senators by the President of the Senate, and 5 Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000, to be expended by the commission for actual and necessary travelling expenses and subsistence, while discharging its official duties outside the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE STATUTE FOR COPYRIGHT REGISTRATION OF DESIGNS

Mr. VESTAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 502 (H. R. 11852), amending the statutes of the United States to provide for copyright registration and design. It was passed over temporarily.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if the committee has agreed to the amendment proposed by the National Dry Goods Association?

Mr. VESTAL. One amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. RAMSPECK. How about the other?

Mr. VESTAL. The other one the committee has not agreed to. I have no objection to its being offered, but I do not think the second amendment ought to be incorporated into the bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Under those conditions, Mr. Speaker, I will have to object.

COAST GUARD CUTTER ON LAKE ERIE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12284) to provide for the construction of vessels for the Coast Guard for rescue and assistance work on Lake Erie.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I do not think it should be necessary to limit in legislation the construction of a vessel to any particular water. We would not appropriate, for example, for a cruiser for the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. CROSSER. It does not limit its use to those waters, but says that it must be suitable in construction for service on Lake Erie.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It says:

To be of design and construction suitable for service in assisting shipping on the waters of Lake Erie.

Mr. CROSSER. That is all right.

Mr. JENKINS. Substitute the Great Lakes for Lake Erie.

Mr. CROSSER. They have one already provided for Lake Michigan.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But I am not willing to assign this boat to any particular water. I think it is bad legislation to authorize the building of a cutter for any one lake, just as it would be to authorize a cruiser for the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. CROSSER. The language used is the technical language heretofore used in regard to a similar vessel for Lake Michigan.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Suitable for service on that lake, it says. If it is suitable for service there why not on other lakes? What is the difference in suitability so far as Lake Erie or Lake Michigan is concerned?

Mr. CROSSER. Oh, there is a lot of difference. Lake Erie is much shallower and more easily agitated by storms.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I am talking about the lakes.

Mr. CROSSER. And the depth of Lake Superior is far greater than that of the others.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But a ship can draw only so much water.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not see any report or any direct statement that the Treasury Department has recommended this, or that the Budget has had a chance to look at it. I am very sympathetic with the work of the Coast Guard and such purposes as this, but unless the Coast Guard finds that it has a need for this ship, I do not see why it should be authorized.

Mr. CROSSER. The commandant of the Coast Guard said to me that such a vessel should be provided for Lake Erie. There is no formal report.

Mr. CRAMTON. With that statement from the gentleman I shall not object, but I suggest that it would be much better if the report contained a report from the Budget.

Mr. CROSSER. I wanted revenue cutters for both Lake Erie and Lake Superior, because I think that they are both badly needed, and the fact is that the Coast Guard would like cutters for both of these lakes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I never heard of the Coast Guard or any other department refusing any proper request.

Mr. CROSSER. If the gentleman wants to take the responsibility for preventing the furnishing of this protection for human lives, well and good.

Mr. CRAMTON. Has the Coast Guard such a ship on Lake Erie?

Mr. CROSSER. Not one.

Mr. CRAMTON. Acting on my own knowledge, I know that such boats are necessary. With the gentleman's statement that the Coast Guard desire this and that there is no ship on Lake Erie, I am not going to object.

Mr. CROSSER. Did the gentleman read the report that I filed with the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. CROSSER. That states the facts in regard to the matter.

Mr. CRAMTON. If there is no such ship, I shall not object.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is only one Coast Guard ship on the Great Lakes, and that is at the Sault. Years back there was a Coast Guard vessel on the Great Lakes, the *Tuscarora*, assigned to the port of Milwaukee. Recently we passed a bill for a Coast Guard vessel for service on Lake Michigan, and this is one to provide for Coast Guard service on Lake Erie.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Does the gentleman object to my proposed amendment?

Mr. CROSSER. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to construct and equip one Coast Guard cutter, to be of design and construction suitable for service in assisting shipping on the waters of Lake Erie: *Provided*, That the total cost of construction and of original equipment of said Coast Guard cutter shall not exceed the sum of \$650,000.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LA GUARDIA: Line 6, after the word "Erie," insert "and other of the Great Lakes."

The amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE FROM WABASHA, MINN., TO NELSON, WIS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10823) to grant a right of way or easement over lands of the United States within the Upper Mississippi River Wild Life

and Fish Refuge to the Wabasha-Nelson Bridge Co., assignee of the Wabasha Bridge Committee, for the construction of a bridge from Wabasha, Minn., to Nelson, Wis., as authorized by the act of March 10, 1928, as amended December 13, 1929.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the request of the gentleman from Minnesota will not be granted. Let three objectors remove this outrageous bill from the calendar, and if, in the closing days of the session, the bill comes up for consideration in the House under suspension of the rules we should vote almost unanimously against its passage.

I am surprised to find that a Member from the great progressive State of Minnesota introduced such a monopolistic monstrosity. The Wabasha-Nelson Bridge Co. has by act of Congress obtained the right to erect a private toll bridge, and here we have a bill granting this company the right to construct a road to be used in connection with the toll bridge. This road right of way to be 200 feet wide and extend through a Government wild life and fish refuge. It is hardly conceivable that such legislation should be seriously offered and sponsored from the great progressive State of Minnesota. I object.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I want the gentleman to know that this bridge is financed by local citizens of Minnesota and Wisconsin. There is no monopolistic capital employed in the construction of this bridge. The bridge is now about half constructed.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I congratulate the gentleman on his efforts to try to pull the chestnuts of a colleague from Minnesota off the fire. This bill gives the private toll-bridge monopoly not only the right to build a toll bridge over the Mississippi River, but it gives them the right to build a road 200 feet wide in connection with said bridge within the confines of a Federal Government wild life and fish refuge. It further gives the Secretary of Agriculture the right and authority to permit this private toll-bridge company to use this 200-foot right of way for other than highway purposes. Section 2 provides that this Wabasha-Nelson Bridge Co. will have the right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act with reference to the 200-foot right of way within the confines of the wild life and fish refuge.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will let the bill go over now under a unanimous-consent request, there will be no danger, because as long as it goes over it is not passed; but if you object to a unanimous-consent request that it shall go over and then not get three objectors later, the bill would pass in spite of the gentleman's opposition.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Although there is but a small attendance in the House now, I have confidence that there will be three objectors. Therefore I renew my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin, Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri, Mr. PATTERSON, and Mr. LA GUARDIA objected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

GEORGE WASHINGTON BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION IN 1932

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting an address which I made on the radio the other evening on the subject of the coming George Washington celebration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by myself as associate director George Washington Bicentennial Commission, over the National Broadcasting Co. system, Thursday, June 12, 1930:

To understand George Washington and what he means to America of to-day we must think of him as a man and not as an ideal.

As a man we can more nearly take his measure and estimate his greatness. The glamor that has surrounded his name has tended to obscure his human qualities.

It is not my purpose to dwell upon the heroic side of our greatest American. I want to impress upon the people of this country that George Washington was a normal man, subject to normal temptations, normal perplexities, and normal sorrows.

The greatness of George Washington lies in the fact that he surmounted tremendous obstacles and accomplished his purposes through sheer force of character and perseverance.

Let us consider George Washington's career in the order of his outstanding accomplishments.

First, there is the boy, the son of a Virginia farmer, living in the country and having limited educational advantages.

This boy, destined by Providence for such historic achievements, was a normal boy. He was in every sense a good boy, obedient and ambitious. Although he had scant opportunities for schooling, he made the most of what he had.

At an age when other boys are mostly concerned in sports and play, George Washington was seriously devoted to the study of a profession. When barely 16 years old he was commissioned to perform a responsible piece of surveying work which sent him into the wilderness. There he encountered dangers and privations that would have daunted a less sturdy soul. That he performed this work of surveying well has been shown by repeated resurveys along the lines he laid down. In all of these travels George Washington was marvelously observant and found time to make notes of what he saw that served him well in later life.

We find him again, when not yet of age, commissioned to perform important military and diplomatic exploits into the frontier country.

Inheriting the great estate of Mount Vernon, while still a young man, George Washington showed unusual interest in the subject of farming. He was the first scientific farmer in this country. He was the first student of methods of improving livestock, of rotating crops, and of diversified husbandry. Had George Washington done nothing more than devote himself to the study of agriculture, he would have been America's pioneer authority on that subject.

Not only was George Washington a farmer but he was one of the foremost business men of his time. He knew how to make his farms profitable. He had a commercial vision far beyond his contemporaries. He organized corporations, opened mines and quarries, and did a considerable shipping business.

George Washington was the first inland-waterways advocate. He actually surveyed and planned waterway connections between the Ohio Valley and the Atlantic seaboard, which he was unable to complete because of the stress of the times.

George Washington looked beyond the boundaries of the original thirteen Colonies and his eyes rested upon the Pacific Ocean as the limits of the future Republic. To him, more than to any other man, is due that impetus to foreign trade which has ever been America's outstanding business policy.

Although he lived in a period that produced many great men of varied attainments, in every character Washington was superior to all.

But George Washington was too great a man to live in the peaceful security of his plantation home. The times called for leadership. The state of the Colonies demanded the resourcefulness, the courage, the calm judgment, and the character of its greatest men. George Washington had all of these qualities to a greater extent than any other man upon American soil. He was a natural leader and instilled into his countrymen that spirit of confidence and devotion which made the winning of the War of the Revolution a possibility. His leadership overcame conditions so dispiriting and so discouraging that only he, of all the great men of his time, could have established our independence and enduring Government.

It was George Washington who realized more than any man of his time what the freedom of the Colonies meant to the men and women who were to come after him. It was his counsel, his judgment, and his sure knowledge of men that guided the infant Republic in the formation of our present system of Federal administration.

In advocating American independence George Washington staked his life, his property, and the interests of his family. He realized, perhaps more than any other man, the hazards and uncertainties of a war for independence. Yet, having decided that such a war was inevitable, George Washington brought to the leadership of that war every quality necessary for victory.

Great as were George Washington's achievements as a soldier, far greater were his achievements as a statesman and a citizen.

As the first President, he faced problems never faced by any man. By his wisdom, by his patience, by his persistence he molded the destinies of the young Republic and placed it upon a sure foundation for future growth. As we study the life of this great man there develop new and interesting phases of his character.

Has America sufficiently honored the memory of George Washington? I unhesitatingly say it has not. It is gratifying to every American citizen to realize that the United States is preparing now to express in the most appropriate way possible the honor which is his due.

The Congress of the United States, in recognition of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington which will be observed in 1932, has created a commission to formulate plans to fittingly honor his memory.

At the head of this commission is the President of the United States. Other members of the commission are the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 4 United States Senators, 4 Members of the House of Representatives, and 8 presidential

commissioners. That commission has delegated the formulation of plans and organization of the work to two associate directors, Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant, 3d, and myself.

Congress has asked the governors of the various States to appoint State commissions to cooperate with the national commission. This is one way the associate directors hope to make this celebration nationwide and all-American.

We have no exposition in mind. There will be no world's fair, no concentration of material evidences of the Nation's growth.

The celebration will be in the hearts of the people themselves. It will be in the nature of a revival of knowledge of and appreciation for our greatest American, and the greatest human being in all history.

The Federal Government has authorized the publication of all of the definitive writings of George Washington, which will be published as a memorial edition in approximately 25 volumes. The great memorial boulevard between Washington and Mount Vernon is under construction and will be one of the most beautiful highways in all the world. A regional park system for the National Capital, unsurpassed in America, is now authorized by Congress as a George Washington Memorial Parkway. This great parkway will include some of the beautiful and historic places with which George Washington has been intimately identified.

Congress has also established Wakefield, Washington's birthplace in Virginia, as a national park and will erect upon the site a replica of the house in which George Washington was born. It is also proposed to build in the city of Washington a great George Washington memorial auditorium, which is most urgently needed.

These are Federal projects contributed, or to be contributed, by the Government itself. It is the purpose of the associate directors to bring the message of George Washington to every church, every home, every school, and every group of citizens in the United States. We want to offer an opportunity to each man, woman, and child in America to participate in this national celebration.

In our plans it is proposed to foster and encourage in all parts of the country, local, regional, and State celebrations. These celebrations the people themselves will organize and take part in them. It is hoped that in 1932 there will not be a schoolroom or school building in the United States without its pictures of George Washington. It is hoped that there will not be a school or a church or a home that will not display the American flag, with appropriate reminders of what it means in our national life. It is proposed to hold essay contests, pageants, plays, and exercises of similar kinds in public schools. In like manner we want to enlist the cooperation of all the clubs, associations, fraternal organizations, and miscellaneous groups of people.

Not only do we want to impress upon the Nation its debt to George Washington but also our debt to other heroes associated with him. We want to remember those splendid men and women, many of them of foreign birth, who offered their lives upon the altar of American independence. We want to remember Von Steuben, De Kalb, and the Muhlenbergs. We want to remember Carroll, Barry, Knox, and the host of other Irish patriots. We want to remember with gratitude Kosciuszko, Pulaski, and other Polish heroes. We want to remember Lafayette, Rochambeau, and De Grasse, and all that other host of equally heroic men and women of the Italian, Swedish, Spanish, and other European races, who performed their parts so valiantly. Many of them came from across the seas to help the cause of the Colonies.

George Washington was the magnet who drew all those brave men to him. George Washington was a man, above all others, who inspired confidence and devotion among those ragged, hungry, and suffering troops who struggled bravely and triumphantly forward under his leadership.

We Americans to-day still have our differences in origin and in character. We still have our different viewpoints and our different opinions. We still struggle for various ideals and principles, but we can all rally to-day under the leadership of George Washington, as did those splendid Americans of 200 years ago.

In honoring the memory of George Washington, there can be no division and no dispute. He is so transcendently great as to continue his influence down through the years. In all the records of his life, in every letter, speech, and act, which can be traced to him, there is not one weakness, or one mistake. Wherever the flag flies to-day, those under its protecting folds should remember that it was George Washington who established that flag and what it stands for. In a world of bitterness, hostility, and oppression George Washington brought freedom and human liberty. Wherever people are free, they should remember those men who gave the world freedom. Wherever there is protection, peace, and security, a prayer of thanksgiving should be offered that George Washington lived and wrought.

We of the George Washington Bicentennial Commission have a tremendous responsibility. It is our duty to arouse throughout the Nation a proper sense of gratitude to the founder of the Republic. In this task we can not act alone.

It is for all Americans of all nationalities and all creeds, of all conditions and circumstances, to make the year 1932 a year of thought and reverence for the memory of George Washington. He was so intimately associated with all affairs of life, with the church, with states-

manship, with agriculture, with business, with education, with commerce and, in fact, every phase of exalted citizenship, that no class of our people can disregard their debt to him.

In the task before us we want the people themselves to give us suggestions upon various phases of the celebration. Correspondence is solicited upon any phase of the program. It is especially desired that officers of towns, cities, and school districts write their views upon the subject. The associate directors also will welcome communications from officers of all kinds of civic organizations, both local and general. All such suggestions will be given prompt and careful attention. Please address your suggestions to the George Washington Bicentennial Commission, Washington, D. C.

So let us now dedicate in our hearts the memory of this man. Let us resolve that we shall do him honor and reverence for what he was and what he has given to us. I leave with you this appeal to-night as Americans all, in the freedom and enlightenment which George Washington brought into the world.

MISSISSIPPI SHIPPING CO.

Mr. FREE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 190.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves to suspend the rules and pass S. J. Res. 190. The Chair will state that he recognizes the gentleman now because he has to take a train. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 190

Joint resolution authorizing the Postmaster General to accept the bid of the Mississippi Shipping Co. to carry mail between United States Gulf ports and the east coast of South America

Whereas it appears that the Mississippi Shipping Co., a corporation of the State of Louisiana, did on the 17th day of May, 1929, purchase the trade name, good will, and equipment of the steamship service, known as the Gulf-Brazil River Plate Line, then being operated by the United States Shipping Board between United States Gulf ports and ports on the east coast of South America; and

Whereas it appears that the said Mississippi Shipping Co. had cause to believe and did believe that at the time it purchased said line that a Government mail contract for the carrying of mails over the route covered by said line would be awarded to the purchaser of said line; and

Whereas the Congress in the second deficiency act, approved March 4, 1929, appropriated \$3,400,000 for ocean mail contracts, \$560,000 of which was designated by the Postmaster General in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee of the House as intended to be used for mail pay to the purchaser of said line; and

Whereas it appears that the said Mississippi Shipping Co., the purchaser of said line, did, on the 31st day of March, 1930, submit a bid to carry the mail over said line at a rate of pay within the limits prescribed by law and in compliance with the requirements of the Postmaster General: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized at his discretion to accept said bid of the Mississippi Shipping Co. for carrying the mails over said line, notwithstanding the provisions of section 407 of the merchant marine act of 1928 in respect to the award of ocean mail contracts.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California move to strike out the "whereas" clauses?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the "whereas" clauses will be stricken out. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. A second is demanded.

Mr. FREE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] for 20 minutes.

Mr. FREE. Mr. Speaker, in May, 1929, the Mississippi Shipping Co. purchased what is known as the Gulf-Brazil River Plate Line to the seacoast of South America. There were 12 vessels in this fleet. They purchased those vessels with the tacit understanding that they would get a mail contract to go with the line. The Shipping Board, of course, had no such authority to give the contract, because the contracts are let by the Postmaster General. When the bids came up for the mail contract another line, which had not purchased any of these vessels, outbid the Mississippi Shipping Co.

Under the law the Postmaster General has no authority to give a contract to any but the lowest bidder. It is the opinion of the Postmaster General, the opinion of the Shipping Board, and the opinion of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, and the unanimous opinion of the

Senate—because this was passed in the Senate—that in this particular instance the Mississippi Shipping Co. should be permitted to have the mail contract, and the purpose of this bill is to permit them to get this contract.

Mr. LARSEN. Was the bid of the other company lower than the bid of the Mississippi Co.?

Mr. FREE. Yes. There was a bid on a mileage basis. The Mississippi Co., on class 6 ships, bid \$2.50 a mile. The other bid was \$1.74 a mile. On class 5 ships the Mississippi Co. bid was \$4 a mile, and the other company's bid was \$3.50 a mile. On classes 4, 3, and 2 ships the bids were identical.

Mr. LARSEN. How much does that amount to in a year, practically?

Mr. FREE. I have not figured out the exact amount, but it is not consequential.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREE. I yield.

Mr. CRISP. I understand this is to authorize a mail contract to be awarded this shipping company, and the gentleman stated that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries favored it. How about the Post Office Committee? Have they acted upon it, or do they pass upon such matters?

Mr. FREE. They do not act upon these matters, but the Postmaster General is anxious to enter into this contract. General legislation has already passed the House and is now in the Senate, but it is likely to get lost in the congestion. In the meantime this Mississippi Co. will go bankrupt if this contract is not consequential.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREE. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If I remember correctly, the bill which passed the House and which is now pending in the other body provided that the Postmaster General would have authority generally to award mail contracts to purchasers of Shipping Board ships without competitive bidding. Is that not true?

Mr. FREE. Yes; that is true.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And this would simply permit the Mississippi Shipping Co., one company, to have this contract?

Mr. FREE. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Can the gentleman state if that is the last company? If so, there will be no need for the bill then, will there?

Mr. FREE. Of course, there are lines which the Government would like to sell, particularly out of the Gulf, and those lines can not be sold unless mail contracts go with them, because the lines are losing considerable money.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. As the gentleman knows, I opposed very vigorously the bill to which he refers, the general bill?

Mr. FREE. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If this will cure the situation, I will be glad to get it out of the way, but I dislike to see that bill come back and become the law, because I do not think it is fair to exempt any of these lines from competitive bidding.

Mr. FREE. This is the only line that is involved in this way at the present time. This bill applies only to the Mississippi Co. I think everyone is agreed that that company is entitled to relief in this particular case.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman join in opposition to the general bill if it comes back? As I understand it, and I have given it a great deal of thought and study and investigation, this is the only case where the purchase of Shipping Board ships has been made, and they desire to give a mail contract without bidding. If that will clean up the situation I think it would be a good thing.

Mr. FREE. As far as I know, this is the only case of its kind.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREE. I yield.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman says this is the Mississippi Shipping Line?

Mr. FREE. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. Why is the gentleman asking for special favors for any line?

Mr. FREE. Because this line acted in extreme good faith. The Government has been wanting to sell the lines in the Gulf. The Government is maintaining them at a loss. The Mississippi Shipping Co. came in in good faith, the Shipping Board agreed to go as far as they could in helping them get a mail contract.

They did talk to the Postmaster General and he was favorable to giving them a contract, and then another company came in which at the present time has no ships on this line at all, and underbid the Mississippi company. Now, it is desirable to get rid of these lines. This is a very advantageous bid. This company bid \$2,700,000 for these ships and the line, and it is very advantageous to the Government that they take the line and get a contract, whereas if it goes to another company it will

be of no benefit in selling the ships which they are trying to dispose of.

Mr. PALMER. Does the gentleman not think it would be bad policy for the Government to give any specific company any special favors when, under the law, the lowest responsible bidder is the one who should receive the mail contract?

Mr. FREE. I may say that a bill passed the House, I do not know whether the gentleman voted for it or not, giving the Postmaster General discretion in these matters, so that these contracts might go with the ships which the Government sells and not go to other people who are not buying Government ships.

Mr. PALMER. Does the gentleman mean to tell the House that the Postmaster General is asking that as a special favor for this company?

Mr. FREE. He is not asking it as a special favor. He is asking it as a matter of justice. He believes that this is only fair to this company, because the company has acted in utmost good faith.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREE. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Is it not a fact that, if this bill becomes law, the Government will save money in the end, because this corporation will continue to operate the ships, and if they do not get a mail contract, the ships go back to the Shipping Board?

Mr. FREE. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Is this the case where bids were opened last fall and were canceled?

Mr. FREE. No. The bids were not canceled. This company was given an opportunity to increase its bid, and they increased their original bid from \$1,155,285 to \$2,700,000.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Did the gentleman's committee hold hearings on this bill?

Mr. FREE. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Was it brought out in the hearings that this company which underbid the Mississippi Shipping Co., had no boats running in this lane, the purpose of the low bid being to try to put the Mississippi Shipping Co. out of business so that they could get in and have a monopoly on the trade?

Mr. FREE. Of course, the contention of that company is that it would get ships somewhere and put them on this run. Where they would get them I do not know, but they would not get Government ships. In other words, they could not get this line, because it is already sold.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. This corporation which underbid the Mississippi Shipping Co. did not want any competition. Is that not the fact?

Mr. FREE. I suppose that is true.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREE. I yield.

Mr. McFADDEN. The Mississippi Shipping Co. was organized for the purpose of buying these boats?

Mr. FREE. Yes.

Mr. McFADDEN. Especially for that purpose?

Mr. FREE. Yes.

Mr. McFADDEN. As a matter of fact, if this bill is passed they will receive a subsidy for buying and operating those boats?

Mr. FREE. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREE. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. I wish to state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN] that the Mississippi Shipping Co., as managing operator, had been operating these ships in this service, in regular sailings, for 10 years. The line was advertised and sold by the Shipping Board. The Mississippi Shipping Co. acquired the line at a price of about \$2,800,000, and they paid \$700,000 in cash, and, under the advertisement of sale and contract of purchase which they made, they contracted to operate these ships in the same service and in regular, specified sailings, under the American flag, for not less than five years. They are now operating under that contract.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. McFADDEN. Do I understand they had been operating the same boats under lease from the Government?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; for 10 years.

Mr. McFADDEN. For 10 years prior to this time?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. McFADDEN. And it is a local company, is it?

Mr. DAVIS. It is a local company. The stockholders are citizens of New Orleans, some in St. Louis I believe, and I think some of the stockholders live in Chicago; but the whole

Mississippi Valley is interested in the Gulf ports and in the large traffic of the Gulf, and consequently in this line.

Mr. McFADDEN. So, this company for 10 years prior was operating, carrying the mails under contract?

Mr. DAVIS. It was not carrying mails under contract, because the Jones-White bill authorizing that was not enacted until 1928, and shortly thereafter this line was sold and this company became the purchaser. One of the reasons, as was stated on the floor by the advocates of the Jones-White bill, advocating these ocean mail contracts, was that it would expedite the sale of the various Shipping Board services and insure the maintenance of the services by private companies; permit the Shipping Board and the Government to get out of the business by selling them, and then having the purchaser obtain a mail contract. If this company should not obtain this mail contract it will simply mean that the ships will have to go back to the Government because the company can not complete paying for them, and can not operate them in competition with another line which is given a mail contract and which comes in and establishes a service in competition with it.

Mr. McFADDEN. What was the amount of this lowest bid for carrying the mail?

Mr. DAVIS. They bid \$2.50 per mile on most of the ships.

Mr. McFADDEN. What is it in total?

Mr. DAVIS. It amounts to \$560,000 a year, and they are to make not less than 36 round-trip sailings per annum.

Mr. McFADDEN. In other words, the Government is paying \$560,000 a year subsidy to these people for buying these ships?

Mr. DAVIS. No; that is not it at all. The Government has entered into contracts for over \$20,000,000 in mail contracts, and out of the \$20,000,000 less than \$1,000,000 goes to the Gulf, notwithstanding the fact that about one-third of the foreign commerce of the United States goes in and out of the Gulf, and notwithstanding the fact that the Jones-White Act stated that these contracts should be equitably distributed among the different sections of the country and different ports. If it is a subsidy it is a subsidy with respect to all of these other companies in the North Atlantic and Pacific who have been awarded these mail contracts aggregating over \$20,000,000 and all of them, except one, I believe, were awarded the mail contracts at the highest price permitted under the Jones-White Act.

Mr. McFADDEN. Then it is a fact that we are awarding contracts to people or companies for the purpose of selling the ships and we are paying a higher price for the carrying of the mails as an inducement to these companies to buy these boats, as in this instance, \$560,000? Is that the general principle that is established?

Mr. DAVIS. As a matter of fact, most of the mail contracts that have been awarded have been awarded to lines which never purchased their ships from the Shipping Board at all. But, as I said, and I stand by it, one of the motives back of the Jones-White bill was that it was thought it would enable the Shipping Board to dispose of its Shipping Board services, as they were intending to do and apparently determined to do, and at the same time insuring the continued maintenance of the services instead of wrecking them and losing the large amounts which had been expended in establishing them.

Mr. McFADDEN. Referring to the Mississippi Shipping Co. buying these particular boats, can the gentleman tell us how much they paid down on these boats?

Mr. DAVIS. About \$700,000.

Mr. McFADDEN. And the total purchase price was how much?

Mr. FREE. Two million seven hundred thousand dollars. The gentleman from Pennsylvania should understand that this line was being maintained at a great loss before this sale, so, as a matter of fact, the Government is not losing what would appear on the face of the bill.

Mr. McFADDEN. The Government was operating the lines?

Mr. FREE. The Government was operating the lines and the Mississippi Shipping Co. was the operator for the Government, and the line was being maintained at a loss, so that the giving of this contract is not going to mean that the Government is going to be out that whole amount of money, because it has been out a lot of money all the while.

Mr. McFADDEN. What was the annual loss?

Mr. FREE. I have forgotten, but quite a considerable amount.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly—and I think it is a distinct loss to the country and to the future of the American merchant marine—that our very able and distinguished colleague from Tennessee, Judge DAVIS, is now on the wrong side of this question. He has rendered some very useful service in checking the beginning of the consideration and the administration, if you please, of the merchant marine act, and

to see him and hear him take the floor in defense of this bill is a matter of grave concern to me and should be to everybody else who has the interest of the merchant marine at heart.

Now, gentlemen, questions were asked whether this company operated Shipping Board ships prior to this contract. The answer is yes; but that is not the complete answer, gentlemen. This company operated Shipping Board ships for 10 years at a loss and was paid for doing it. No one can deny that. They had these Government ships, the Government sustained all of the losses and they were paid handsomely for losing Government money. Then they purchased these ships—I am sure there can not be any difference on the facts—after the ships were reconditioned, at a sum way below the market price of the ships. The sale in and of itself was a subsidy, and now they come in and they want the mail contract without competitive bidding.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania asked the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from California about the mail contracts. My friend from Pennsylvania should understand that does not mean they are going to carry any mail. That does not mean they will carry one pound of first-class mail. I read into the RECORD the Export Line's sailings and the amount of mail carried by those ships. In one instance it was one pound of first-class mail, for which they received \$24,000. In another case three pounds of first-class mail were carried. Of course, it is a subsidy, a plain subsidy, called a mail contract.

Let us understand the facts. When the bill was before the House on the call of the Merchant Marine Committee, I opposed it. The bill provided that the Postmaster General could issue a mail contract to purchasers of Shipping Board vessels without competitive bidding. That bill was very broad and it afforded an opportunity for very much favoritism because, I repeat, the purchasers of Shipping Board vessels are in most cases operators who, through their incompetency, through lack of experience, and other reasons which I need not mention here, were paid for losing money for the Government. Then they purchased these ships, and they refused to enter into fair and open competitive bidding. We find, then, that there is objection to that bill, and yet we are now confronted with a resolution which will permit the Mississippi Shipping Co. to come in under the wire.

If we could end it here, a few million dollars more or less in comparison with what is being wasted at this time, would not make much difference, but we have no assurance either from the gentleman from California or the gentleman from Tennessee, in the absence of the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH], that the bill giving blanket authority for such awarding of mail contracts without competitive bidding will not be abandoned. If we could have such assurance, it would not be so bad; but we have not even that assurance and the sole purpose of this, as the resolution frankly states, is to permit the Mississippi Shipping Co. to obtain this contract without bidding.

Gentlemen, we are not going to build up an American merchant marine if subsidies are to be given to companies and to individuals who specialize in losses and in the operation of ships as a failure. This is a premium on incompetency, lack of experience, and hopeless failure. Just think of it. I will defy anyone to point out in the history of commerce or of industry where our operators have been paid a premium on their losses. It is not sufficient to have paid them a premium or a salary for operating at a loss, but we now want to provide that when we sell them a ship at far below the market value of the ship, they are to receive a mail contract equal to the commissions or to the premiums which they received theretofore for operating the ship at a loss. This is your merchant marine act as it is being administered at this time, and this is not going to build up an American merchant marine.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. McFADDEN. As I understood the answer of the gentleman from Tennessee to my question, this shipping company is paying down \$700,000 in the purchase of these boats.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Did they pay that in cash? Who will stand up here and say they paid \$700,000 in cash?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; that is my information, from a reliable source—that they have paid \$700,000 on the ships.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. How much are the ships worth based on their market value?

Mr. DAVIS. They contracted to pay the highest price that has been paid for cargo vessels of the Shipping Board since the World War. That is how much they paid.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. How much a ton?

Mr. DAVIS. I think about \$28 a ton.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And is it not true that the Shipping Board paid over \$35 a ton to recondition these ships?

Mr. DAVIS. No; I am sure that is not the fact.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. How much did they pay to recondition the ships?

Mr. DAVIS. I am advised that \$357,727 was spent in reconditioning these 12 ships. Of course, all the ships that have been laid up, before they are put into service, frequently have to have some reconditioning, but these ships have been in service for years and years.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is why they need reconditioning. The gentleman, who is an expert on our merchant marine, knows that.

Mr. DAVIS. The Shipping Board put the ships in good, serviceable condition, I presume. This Mississippi Shipping Co. will be required to build some entirely new ships, larger and speedier ships, to be placed in the service, if they get the contract.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And for which the Government will lend them 75 per cent of the value of each ship, is not that correct?

Mr. DAVIS. That is true; just like any other company that borrows money to build ships.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And is it not also true that in many instances in the sale of Shipping Board vessels they were sold to former operators for less than what it cost to recondition such ships?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; there have been some instances of that kind, and I disapprove of it just as much as the gentleman from New York, and have several times criticized individual instances of that kind.

Mr. McFADDEN. The question I want to ask the gentleman is this. Am I correct that in addition to this, this shipping company is to get as a subsidy \$560,000 each year this contract runs?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; and without necessarily carrying any first-class mail. As the gentleman knows, there are several classes of ships. For instance, if there is a sailing of a fast ship, a nonsubsidized fast ship, the Post Office Department must necessarily send the first-class mail on that ship and pay the regular rate, while the ship of this line may sail the same day, out of the same port, to the same destination and carry only parcel post and third-class mail, for which it will receive this \$560,000 for the 36 guaranteed trips under its mail contract.

Mr. PATTERSON. Does the gentleman from New York make the statement here that many ships have been sold for less than it cost to recondition them and that they have also provided a further subsidy in the letting of these contracts?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, yes.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. I notice in this bill it is provided that the Postmaster General is authorized at his discretion to accept said bid of the Mississippi Shipping Co. for carrying the mails over said lines, notwithstanding the provisions of section 407 of the merchant marine act of 1928. Now, notice what section 407 is:

Each contract for the carrying of ocean mails under this title shall be awarded to the lowest bidder who, in the judgment of the Postmaster General, possesses such qualifications as to insure proper performance of the mail service under the contract.

In other words, you seek in this bill that I am asked to vote for to take away this power and to authorize the Postmaster General to make this award to this particular company regardless of what its bid may be.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Exactly; and to companies and individuals, if you please, in every instance who operated Government ships theretofore at a loss and were paid for it.

Mr. PALMER. Absolutely. I could not vote for a bill like that.

Mr. FOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. FOSS. Does the Postmaster General recommend the passage of this bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; he does; and I will say in all frankness it is one of those situations that the present administration inherited from the previous administration, and there may be a moral obligation, because the Shipping Board has been playing favorites and has been making promises that it was not authorized under the law to make, and this is one of the things that we inherit from the incompetency of the Shipping Board and from the favoritism of the chairman of the Shipping Board, Mr. O'Connor; and President Hoover ought to take him out of there if he ever hopes to have the merchant marine act administered intelligently.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FREE) there were 48 ayes and 21 noes.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRADING AND CLASSIFICATION OF CLERKS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9110) for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. TEMPLE, Mr. FISH, and Mr. LINTHICUM.

APPLYING THE PENSION LAWS TO THE COAST GUARD

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 12099) to apply the pension laws to the Coast Guard.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of sections 4692, 4693, 4702, and 4703, Revised Statutes of the United States, with subsequent amendatory acts, commonly known as the general pension law, be extended to the officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard and their widows, children, and other dependents, under the same regulations and restrictions as are or may be provided by law with respect to officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy.

SEC. 2. The benefits provided by this act shall include claims for pension based upon diseases contracted, or death or injury incurred, in service and in line of duty, from and after the date of approval of this act: *Provided, however,* That the date of commencement of pension granted hereunder shall commence from date of filing application in the Bureau of Pensions, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

SEC. 3. That no claim agent or attorney or other person shall contract for, demand, receive, or retain a fee of more than \$10 for services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting a claim for original pension under this act; and no more than \$2 in a claim for increase of pensions, which fee shall be payable only on the order of the Commissioner of Pensions; and any person who shall, directly or indirectly, otherwise contract for, demand, receive, or retain a fee for services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any claim under this act, or shall wrongfully withhold from the pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of the pension allowed or due such pensioner or claimant under this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall for each and every offense be fined not exceeding \$500 or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. JENKINS. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is a bill reported unanimously from the Committee on Pensions and seeks to provide pensions for the Coast Guard. At present the Coast Guard of the country, which is stationed around lighthouses and life-saving stations, does not come within the purview of present pension legislation.

They are enlisted as men are enlisted in the Army and the Navy and serve out their enlistment, subject to court-martial, and so forth. They are in every respect a military organization, except in time of peace they are not strictly a military organization but an adjunct to the Army and Navy. In time of war they automatically pass into a military organization of the country.

This bill seeks to put them under the regular pension law and provides the same pensions as are given to soldiers of the Army and if any of them are in the Navy the same as they get in the Navy.

This bill is fostered principally by those Members who are naturally interested in the Coast Guard and have Coast Guards in their districts. I am not so familiar as are some other Members, I am presenting it because the chairman of the committee is not here, being otherwise engaged on important legislative matters. I will yield time to Members from those districts.

I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take much of the time of the House, but I want to point out that this law will only cost a maximum of \$30,000 a year. Under the law passed

and approved January 28, 1915, the Coast Guard was declared a part of the military forces of the United States. They have no pension disability status similar to that enjoyed by the Army and the Navy. This simply extends to them the same disability pension as is provided for by law for the Army and the Navy.

It meets with the approval of the Budget and of the Treasury Department, and I think in justice to the Coast Guard it ought to pass. We should no longer deny them this measure of simple justice.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACON. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. In the event that death occurs in line of duty, what pension would the widow get under the terms of this bill?

Mr. BACON. That is all set out in the report. It would be just the same as in the case, under existing law, of a soldier or sailor in the Regular Army or Navy. This bill merely gives the same benefits to the Coast Guard now enjoyed under existing law by the Army and Navy.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. There is no reason that anyone can advance why the Congress of the United States should not immediately revise the general pension laws of this country. You take a marine killed in Nicaragua and his mother, his dependent mother, will get \$12 a month. That is outrageous.

Mr. BACON. I agree with the gentleman, but that question is not involved in this bill.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I objected last time to this bill when it was under consideration. I would like to know of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] whether this will not be an encouragement to the Coast Guard to go out and shoot people without justification, as the evidence has disclosed in several cases.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is involved in this legislation.

Mr. SABATH. We desire to be human in our consideration of the Coast Guard and help them, but, on the other hand, they ought to be humane in the performance of their duty.

Mr. BACON. The major function of the Coast Guard is the saving of life at sea, and if a coast guardsman is injured, for example, on the Alaskan coast, in an endeavor to save lives at sea, under the present situation he can not receive any pension.

Mr. BRIGGS. And is it not a fact that the Coast Guard by international agreement patrols the iceberg lane?

Mr. BACON. That is true. It is one of the most hazardous services in our Government. The self-sacrifice and devotion to duty by the Coast Guard is not exceeded by any other Government service.

Mr. BRIGGS. And that service has been of inestimable value to the people of the United States and the people of the world as well.

Mr. BACON. It has saved thousands of lives and millions of dollars.

Mr. BRIGGS. And we would probably have had many *Titanic* disasters otherwise.

Mr. BACON. That is true.

Mr. MEAD. For the sake of the peace of mind for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is it not true that we will restore the Coast Guard to its former glory as soon as we eliminate prohibition, which will take place very shortly?

Mr. BACON. That is another question that is not involved in this legislation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, there are more Coast Guard stations in my district than any other one in the Nation. It is my pleasure to know personally all of the men in those stations and to be on intimate terms of friendship with them, for I have never known a more honorable, capable, or efficient class in my life. I have visited all of these stations, and therefore have come in closest contact with the Coast Guard and its work. I have personally seen the surfboats toll through mountainous seas and bring to safety human beings, and I have seen men, women, and children landed in the breeches buoy when all hope seemed lost.

Since I first entered Congress I became interested in this legislation, and believe that the first speech ever made in this body on the subject was by me over four years ago. The bill now under consideration is a committee bill, and is a result of bills introduced by Mr. BACON of New York, Mr. CRAMTON of Michigan, and myself in cooperation between us. I was asked to sponsor it by hundreds of members of the Coast Guard from Maine to Florida.

This bill, as stated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], applies the pension laws to the Coast Guard in the same manner as they apply to the Army and Navy. I am sure that only a very few Members knew that there was this in-

equality. No less an authority on government than the late Martin B. Madden heard of it only a few days before his death, and assured me if he lived he would wipe out this discrimination. The provisions of the bill are a disappointment to me because they do not go far enough. The bill ought to go back to the time the organization was given its present name, and pensions should apply from that time. Since 1925, 62 brave men have lost their lives on account of the law-enforcement activities of the Coast Guard, and their widows, if dependency was proven, were turned adrift by the Government with six months' pay that their husbands received. I am appealing to the House, however, to pass this measure, because it has the approval of the Budget, and in my opinion is the best we can get at this time. I hope that when it goes to the Senate it will see fit to liberalize it, and, failing in that, we will strive to get additional legislation in future years.

It is a source of gratification to me that we are now willing to go this far, and to right a wrong that has always existed. The passage of this bill will bring joy and encouragement to the Coast Guard, and I hope there will not be a vote against it.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to extend the provisions of the general pension laws to the members of the Coast Guard. Men who daily risk their lives in discharge of their duty are certainly entitled to this recognition, but I rise now to complain of the inadequacy of our general pension law. If the widow of a member of the Coast Guard elected to accept a pension should her husband lose his life in line of duty—and remember that the duty of the Coast Guard is no longer confined to saving lives at sea but to stopping rum runners, and at all times in danger of stopping their bullets—she would receive the sum of \$12 per month and \$2 additional for every child under 16 years of age.

The soldiers, sailors, and marines are subject to our general pension law. Let one be killed in line of duty and if married his wife and children receive the \$12 a month and \$2 for each additional child. This also applies to our marines killed in Nicaragua.

My contention is that the Congress should revise the general pension law of the country. Make provisions for our Military and Naval Establishment, so that in the event the men are injured or lose their lives in time of peace they will receive proper recognition.

In the case of the officers the rates of pension range from \$15 to \$30, and is determined by the rank of the officer at the time of the incurrence of the disability or death. This is shown on page 4 of the report.

I want to express the hope that the Pension Committee of the House will take up the question of revising the general pension law as soon as the Congress meets in December. We are taking care of the World War, Spanish War, Indian wars, Civil War, and Mexican War veterans, so why not do justice to those serving in the Regular Establishment.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is a bill that should have passed years ago. The Coast Guard is one of the most effective organizations in the country. I am proud to know that our Government is now going to take care of the dependents of these worthy men and give to them the same pensionable status as in the Army and the Navy. I have quite a number of Coast Guard stations in my district and I know the hardships that these people have to undergo.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman think that this bill, if enacted, would take care of the Immigration Bureau patrol when it is transferred into the unified patrol under the Coast Guard management?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I should think so, and if it does not, I should be pleased to have it do so. The Coast Guard is older than the Navy. The Coast Guard was here before the Navy. It is the only service in the Government that is not taken care of by a pensionable status. I know the case of one boy who was badly crippled on a winch on one of these Coast Guard cutters. He died from these injuries, and his people have never received a cent of any kind from the Government because there was no pensionable status. I see before me my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT], who was the author of the bill to take care of the disabled members of the old life-saving service. I am delighted that we are at last giving the Coast Guard some of the things to which they are entitled, as in this bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, until I heard the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN] say that there were more Coast Guard stations in his district than in any other, I thought there were more in mine. Of course, it is my duty as well as my pleasure to say a word for this bill.

I consider that at the present time this service is the real military arm of the Government that stands in peace times to be fired upon in real warfare. Having lived near the seacoast all my life, I realize that these men are in constant danger of life in fighting the elements and as well as enforcement of the laws against smuggling. My chief pleasure in advocating this bill at this time is that I do not think there will be any such large turnovers in the service in the future. We must make the service more attractive.

My old sea captain friends like to tell me that we now have so many youngsters in the Coast Guard that if a wreck occurs volunteers from the old-timers would be needed. I think this bill is an act of justice and will make our Coast Guard Service more attractive and efficient.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the temper of the House, and its desire on every opportunity to extend the pension laws of the Government to the civilian service of the country. This is just the beginning of the extension of the pension laws to all persons employed in the civilian activities of the Government. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] suggests that the Immigration Service will presently be brought under the Coast Guard Service. Some of the older Members, perhaps a half-dozen only, or maybe more, will remember the efforts made by the late head of this service, Mr. Kimball, who fought for 10 or 15 years to get retirement pay for members of this service, then known as the Revenue Cutter Service. There were then some old-fashioned Representatives who opposed the entering wedge of retirement pay for that civilian character of service, but the pressure became so great that those who had been opposing that character of legislation for fear of the precedent that would be established at last receded, and we provided retirement pay. Now you propose to give a pensionable status to the Coast Guard, regardless of whether the disabilities are incurred in war or in peace time. To-day they are recipients of the benefits of the compensation service. If you pass this law the next step will inevitably be to extend it to the Lighthouse Service, the Immigration Service, and then to every civilian employee. I take this opportunity now to point out the inevitable trend that Congress is pursuing and will pursue when we pass this character of legislation, to include not only compensation pay, but pensionable status to all civilian classes in the Government.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill passed.

On motion of Mr. JENKINS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DONATIONS OF SITES FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 12343.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 12343. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, accept on behalf of the United States the donation of sites for public buildings, etc., in cases when allocation of funds have been or may hereafter be reported to Congress under the provisions of the public buildings act, approved May 25, 1926, and acts amendatory thereof, notwithstanding that specific authorization for the acquisition of sites in such cases may not yet have been made by Congress.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands a second.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] for 20 minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this bill has been up before. It was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], who is unavoidably absent to-day looking after the business of the Government.

Under the existing law the Secretary of the Treasury has the authority to accept the gift of the site of a public building where

Congress has already appropriated the money to construct a building. All this bill does is this: That where the Treasury Department has allocated funds to a place and Congress has not yet appropriated money for that place, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept the gift of a title for a public building site in that town.

This is not a matter that I have any more than a passing interest in, inasmuch as there is no place in my community that is proposing to offer to give to the Government a site. But up at Wellsboro, Pa., a gentleman whose name I am unable to give you at the present time passed away some time ago, and he had a provision in his will in which he gave to the Federal Government a valuable site in that town upon which to build a public building. He also put a clause in his will to the effect that if this land was not accepted on or before July 1, 1930, this legacy would lapse and become a part of his residuary estate, and the Government would lose it.

Now, I am informed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KIESS], who represents that district in Congress, that the people of that town are very much interested in the Government having permission to accept this site, and if this bill is passed we could accept that site.

I understand from the members of the Committee on Appropriations that there are several other places throughout the country where offers are made to donate sites to the Federal Government if authority were given to accept them.

I know of no reason why this legislation should not become law, because there are certain places in this country where it is very hard to get sites, where the Government is held up, it might be said, by people in the furnishing of sites. If there is an oasis in the desert where people are so liberal and so charitably inclined that they want to give to this Government a site for a public building, I think they should be allowed the privilege of gratifying their ambition to be charitable.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman think this is good policy?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman not think it will have the effect that, throughout the country, there will be sites tendered for buildings in certain localities in order to get preference in location of a new post office?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do not think it would have that effect at all. The only place a site can be accepted under the terms of this bill is a place where the Government has signified its intention to erect a building by allocating funds authorized by law for that purpose.

Mr. MICHENER. It occurred to me that it might happen there would be a town in which a new post office was to be constructed. There would be a fight, as there often is, between locations. As a matter of fact, for the benefit of the town, the post office should go in a given location, but some one in a more undesirable part of the town tenders a site to the Government. If the Government does not accept that site but determines to buy a site in a more desirable part of the town, will the Government not be criticized severely by Members of this body who do not understand the circumstances but who will say the Government bought a site in preference to accepting one donated?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Not necessarily.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. I bring to the attention of my colleague [Mr. MICHENER] that, if this bill does not pass, the Government will proceed to buy sites and advertise for bids, and the undesirable site which my colleague speaks of may be placed in the bid at \$1, which conforms with the law and which brings about the situation just as my colleague states in connection with a donation.

Mr. MICHENER. But the condition suggested by my colleague is entirely theoretical. We have been operating under the present law for a long time, and the condition which the gentleman suggests might arise has never risen.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think, due to the fact that we have long had the policy of accepting donations when it seemed desirable to the department and the Congress, it is also a demonstration that my colleague's theory is one based on theory rather than on practical danger. As a matter of fact, a site will not be accepted as a donation when offered unless it seems to be a desirable one.

Mr. MICHENER. I agree with my colleague, and I want to continue the policy which has proved so satisfactory, and wherever we have cases where we should accept a donation I

think we should pursue the course which we have always pursued and ask Congress to determine the matter rather than some agency or some bureau.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will suggest to the gentleman that Congress does not select these sites in any instance. They are selected by the Secretary of the Treasury, under existing law.

Mr. MICHENER. There is no doubt about that, but that is beside the question.

Mr. ELLIOTT. In the selection of sites for post-office buildings they must be where they will be most accessible to the railroads which bring in the mail. They will have to do that. If a site was bought at some end of the town where it was out of the reach of the railroads, just because they could get a site there would be no reason for getting it.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, the gentleman is partly right and partly wrong in his last statement.

I am advised that they do take into consideration the question of railroads in the larger cities, but in the smaller places, where most of the offices go, the question of the location of the railroad is not a factor.

Mr. ELLIOTT. There might be some cases where it is not, but in my home town they have two railroad depots and they located the Federal building just as nearly half way between these two depots as possible.

Mr. BRIGGS. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that in the law to-day—the public buildings' law—provision is made for the acceptance by the Government of sites in that language which says that sites may be acquired by purchase, exchange, or otherwise.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes; but that only applies where an appropriation has been made for a site or building, while this bill extends it further and makes it apply to cases where there has been nothing but an allocation made.

Mr. BRIGGS. I understand; but it is just an extension of the principle already contained in the law.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. In lines 4 and 5 the bill provides for the acceptance on behalf of the United States the donation of sites for public buildings, "and so forth." It seems to me that is strange legislative language, and I would like to ask the gentleman why that is included in this bill, and just what does it mean?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I did not draw this bill. It was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], as I said before. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the deficiency appropriation bill which will come up to-morrow. In that bill he will find that expression scattered all through it.

Mr. MICHENER. Is that the justification for putting a fool statement like that in permanent legislation?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do not know whether it is a fool statement or not, but I do know this statement is included in the appropriation bill you are going to pass on to-morrow.

Mr. MICHENER. I appreciate the fact that under suspension of the rules a bill is passed without amendment. Is it the gentleman's intention to pass this bill without amendment?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I have made a motion to suspend the rules and pass this bill, and under the rules no amendment can be offered.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. I notice that under the provisions of this bill the Secretary of the Treasury is given the right to accept donations. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that would have a tendency to sell these offices, so to speak, to the highest bidder, and that these buildings would be erected where the most money was offered?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Most assuredly I do not.

Mr. PALMER. Under the present policy and system these buildings are erected where there is an actual need and demand, but such a provision as this might lead these officials to act regardless of any such policy.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do not think so.

Mr. PALMER. And might cause these buildings to be erected where they should not properly go.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Under the language—

Accept on behalf of the United States the donation of sites for public buildings—

would there be any danger of some one accepting a site with reservations? In other words, would there be any danger of getting a site without at the same time getting the fee simple title?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; I think not. They would not accept that.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman explain the extent of the departure from existing law which this legislation suggests. Under existing law is it not possible to donate a site?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Where an appropriation has been made by Congress for a building, but this goes a little further and says that where there has been an allocation by the Treasury Department, but where the Congress has not yet appropriated.

Mr. MEAD. Then this is not a radical departure from existing law?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Oh, no.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Oh, yes it is.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, this bill is good as far as it goes, but should not the gentleman have had a general bill here which would have permitted the Government to accept any site? They are asking tremendous prices for building sites in cities, and if a city wants to give a site to the Government, why not let the Government accept it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am not the godfather of this bill; it just happened to get into my hands to be handled here to-day. What the sponsors of this bill had in mind was this, to accept donations of sites where the Government had signified its intention, either by an appropriation or by an allocation of funds, to build a building.

Mr. BLANTON. And that is good; and if it is good to go that far, why not go farther and accept sites generally. I hope the gentleman will bring in a bill from his committee which will permit the Government to accept sites generally. You take the city of Ballinger, the county seat of Runnels County, Tex. The commissioner's court has agreed to donate a part of the courthouse square, right in the very heart of the city, to the Government without a cent of cost. Why should not the Government be permitted to accept a part of that courthouse square, so that if they wanted to build a building in Ballinger they could do so without having to pay a large sum for a site?

Mr. ELLIOTT. In answer to that I will say to the gentleman that the Government can not accept any sites for buildings until they know they are going to build a building on that site.

Mr. BLANTON. I am in favor of letting the Government accept anything in the world the people want to give it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask a question?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Should the Government accept a site by donation when the location does not meet the business demands of the city?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do not think so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is not that an element that should be considered?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do not think the Secretary of the Treasury would accept a site that would be undesirable.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield a moment further? What is the difference in principle from accepting a site from one of these cities or towns for a public building and accepting a partial contribution of 25 per cent or 50 per cent of the cost of the building? Why should you not then go out and encourage the various cities and towns of the country to make offers to the Government, "We will not only give you a site, but we will pay 25 per cent of the cost of the building if you will locate one here"? This is just an additional incentive to get the Government of the United States to locate a public building at a certain place.

I believe the Government of the United States ought not to pay a dollar more than a site is worth, but I do not believe this Government should go around soliciting, directly or indirectly, the donation of sites in order to secure a place to put up a public building, and I see no difference in principle between accepting a site as an incentive or inducement to put up a building and afterward accepting 25 per cent or 50 per cent of the cost of constructing the building there; and I think this change in policy that we are entering upon of accepting a site free will ultimately lead to our encouraging the citizens of various States to also offer percentages of the cost of the buildings thereafter to be constructed.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to this bill so that it may have your very earnest consideration.

Gentlemen, it will not make one particle bit of difference to the city of New York whether you adopt this bill or not, but it

will make a big difference to you gentlemen representing districts with several small communities within your districts. The bill is undemocratic. It is not in keeping with the policy of our Government. The gentleman from Indiana, in his effort to laud these donors of land, said—and I quote his words—"Why should we not accept the gift of some charitable person?" Does my colleague from Indiana want to put his Government in the position of awaiting a donation of charity in the construction of a public building?

Mr. ELLIOTT. If any citizen loves his Government, does the gentleman know of any reason why he should not have some material way of expressing himself along that line?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Donations to the Government are not democratic, and, as the gentleman from Oklahoma points out, this will start a race, and a city may find itself on top of the list for a public building only to find that some community down at the bottom has donated a site for a post office and will get the appropriation and the allocation of the money. There is no reason why we can not continue under the policy we are now pursuing, and when an offer is made bring your bills here and let Congress decide each one on its merits.

The gentleman speaks of a will up in Pennsylvania containing a donation of some land. I offered an amendment the other day when this bill was up on the Consent Calendar to authorize the acceptance of that particular gift.

The Secretary of the Treasury must necessarily delegate the exercise of these discretionary powers to some subordinate, who, in order to make a showing and to make his appropriation go as far as possible, will accept a donation and parcel out the appropriations of Congress and put up more buildings than perhaps he could otherwise build, to the disadvantage of many communities that may not desire or may not be in a position to offer lands as a gift to the Government.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I understand that when one of these gifts has been made the Congress still has this string to it. If they have taken a site that is not acceptable to this Government, the Congress does not have to appropriate the money to put up the building on that site.

Mr. HASTINGS. How would the Congress ever know about that?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Because this only applies to places where there has been an allocation of funds by the Secretary of the Treasury, which must be carried out by an appropriation by the Congress.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Can the gentleman picture the pressure that will be brought to bear when that offer of land is made? There is just so much money left in the annual appropriation, and it means putting a building there or just buying a site at some other place. There is no answer to that.

Mr. ELLIOTT. This applies to appropriations that have not yet been made.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes; and it is not fair, gentlemen.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I am surprised that the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Oklahoma should shy at this proposition. Every State institution in practically all the States that has been located has been located because of special inducements that have been given by the citizens of a particular community.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That is different.

Mr. BLANTON. Most of the colleges in the States have been located at a particular place because certain counties offered special inducements.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Exactly, in order to attract that institution there.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That is just my objection, and I will say to the gentleman that in my short time in Congress, every time we accepted a donation, the Government got the worst of it, and I will tell the gentleman how. I know of one instance where we accepted some land, which was part of the land needed, and then when we got down there, in order to get water, we had to buy more land at an excessive price. The other day in another great State, that has a large delegation here in Congress, when the Committee on Military Affairs had the call on Calendar Wednesday, we had an instance where land was originally donated, and the Government went down there and now finds it has not enough land and has to buy more land at this particular place.

As the gentleman from Ohio pointed out, the offer of land is an inducement to place the Government public building there. I say that when the United States Government provides for a public building for a post office it should provide it on the merits

of each individual case in every community and township and village alike, and pass on its needs, without the additional attraction of having land donated to it for that public building.

Mr. BLANTON. The State of Texas has millions of dollars of property donated by various communities for the location of State institutions. I am in favor of it. I think the State benefits by it, and I think the Government of the United States will receive benefit by having sites for public buildings donated to it rather than paying exorbitant prices for such sites.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is the gentleman from Texas in favor of putting the Government in the position of waiting for donations of land to it in order to erect public buildings?

Mr. BLANTON. No; but I would rather see the Government get donations of sites than to see it pay enormous and exorbitant prices for the land.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman from Texas is assuming that the Government is going to pay enormous prices, when the gentleman from New York only proposes that they shall pay what it could be condemned for.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ELLIOTT)—there were 60 ayes and 30 noes.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the following titles:

S. 969. An act for the relief of Edna B. Erskine;

S. 3784. An act for the relief of John Marks, alias John Bell; and

S. 3866. An act for the relief of Joseph N. Marin.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 12235) entitled "An act to provide for the creation of the Colonial National Monument in the State of Virginia," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ODDIE, Mr. DALE, and Mr. WALSH of Montana to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 730) entitled "An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes,' approved June 30, 1906, as amended," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McNARY, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. RANDELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

BITTER ROOT IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9990) for the rehabilitation of the Bitter Root irrigation project, Montana.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill as amended. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from the reclamation fund established by the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), the sum of \$750,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, to be used for the rehabilitation of the Bitter Root irrigation project in Montana.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter styled the Secretary, is authorized to use money thus appropriated for the following purposes:

(1) For liquidating bonded and other outstanding indebtedness of such irrigation project on such basis of valuation as the Secretary may regard as equitable, not exceeding 75 per cent of the principal and accrued interest; no portion of such outstanding indebtedness to be liquidated except a total outstanding indebtedness of such project is so liquidated.

(2) For doing or causing to be done under his supervision any construction, betterment, or repair work necessary to place the irrigation system of such project in good operating condition, and as provided for in the contract hereinafter required.

(3) For loaning to such irrigation district, hereinafter provided for, such funds as in the opinion of the Secretary are necessary for any con-

struction, betterment, or repair work to place the irrigation system of such project in good operating condition.

SEC. 3. All funds so used or advanced shall be repaid to the United States within a period, to be fixed by the Secretary, of not more than 40 years, with interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum on the funds so used or advanced from the date of such use or advancement until repaid. Before any funds are so used or advanced a contract or contracts satisfactory to the Secretary shall be executed by an irrigation district, formed under State law, obligating such district to repay the funds so used or advanced as required by this act. Any contract so executed with such district shall require a lien on the land and on the irrigation systems of such project. The operation and maintenance of such project shall be continued by the authorities in charge under the supervision of the Secretary, so far as necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. In case of default in the payment when due of any interest or other charges under any contract executed as herein provided there shall be added to the amount unpaid a penalty of one-half of 1 per cent of the amount unpaid on the 1st day of each month thereafter so long as such default shall continue, such penalties being in addition to the interest provided in section 3. The provisions of any contract executed hereunder may be enforced by suit or by the foreclosure of any lien in the manner authorized by the State laws applicable in similar cases. In addition to other remedies the Secretary, in any contract executed hereunder, may provide that in case of default for more than 12 months in the payment of any installment, the control, operation, and maintenance of the project may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be assumed by the United States and the delivery of water withheld until payments are duly made in accordance with the contract requirements.

SEC. 5. No funds shall be appropriated for the purposes herein authorized until investigation and examination shall have been made of all pertinent conditions surrounding such project and until the Secretary has made a report of his finding in writing to Congress that in his opinion by the action proposed the project can and will be placed upon a sound basis from a financial and economic standpoint so that the funds so used and advanced will be returned to the United States.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make and enforce all needful rules and regulations for effectuating the purposes of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McFADDEN. I demand a second.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish first to call attention of Members of the House to the fact that the bill as it has been offered for passage under suspension of the rules has been amended to conform to the suggestions that were made during the debate on this measure several days ago. These amendments have been offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

On page 2, those of you who have the bill will notice that an amendment has been included as follows; that is, to make paragraph 1 of section 2 read as follows:

(1) For funding or liquidating bonded and other outstanding indebtedness of such irrigation project on such basis of valuation as the Secretary may regard as equitable—

And now this is new—

not exceeding 75 per cent of the principal and accrued interest, no portion of such outstanding indebtedness of such to be liquidated except a total outstanding indebtedness of such project is so liquidated.

I call attention to that before I lay down the purpose of the measure, so that you will have in mind that the bill now before you has been very much benefited by the amendments discussed heretofore on the floor and incorporated in the bill.

At the present time the basic law known as the reclamation act of 1902 involves—

Mr. BRIGHAM. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. LEAVITT. I yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman tell us the amount of the outstanding indebtedness?

Mr. LEAVITT. The amount included in the bill is not to exceed \$750,000, nor to exceed 75 per cent of whatever is the outstanding indebtedness.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Can the gentleman tell the amount of the bonded indebtedness outstanding and the amount of interest outstanding?

Mr. LEAVITT. The gentleman will find that on page 3 of the report. I have only a few minutes, and I will first make my statement and go into the matter of the figures afterwards.

Here is what could be done under existing conditions at the present time: Here is a community in the State of Montana of

over a thousand people. There are probably 2,000 people directly dependent upon the success of this reclamation project for their welfare. There are schools, there is transportation, and there are over 400 landowners at the present time. A number of years ago a reclamation project was put under way under a speculative form of financing, and as it went on the same thing happened that has happened on the Federal reclamation projects. The payments necessary came to be beyond the power of the people to meet. An effort was made to refund, and that was put into effect back in 1923, but the situation is this: About 10 miles of the something like 72 miles of main canal are in the form of wooden flumes, always likely to go out, making the water supply, while it has not yet failed, an uncertainty, adding greatly to the cost of maintenance of the project. What this bill proposes to do is to have the Government enter the picture and do something that under the present reclamation law it could do in a different form. I want to emphasize the fact that we are not proposing to do something entirely new, but something that will come very close to meeting the objection of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN], which he has been making all along to all of the reclamation matters. Instead of using the reclamation fund to bring in new lands and put new people on areas not now being cultivated, this proposal is to save an existing community that for a number of years has been producing crops. It is a community made up of people who during the years have learned how to handle this kind of land.

But the project must be refinanced in such a way that these excellent people can make their payments and make a success from that standpoint.

If the bill is not passed, here is what could be done under the present law. The Federal Government, under the present law, could do just what it has done in New Mexico on the Carlsbad reclamation project. It could enter the field and buy up the project and take it over and make it a Government project, and save it in that way. But in the last few years we have adopted a different reclamation policy, that of trying to put these projects in such form that the people who live on them can themselves take over their management and make out of them a permanent group of homes. For that reason, instead of the Government coming in, as it could now do, and taking over the project, it comes in to the extent of purchasing at not to exceed 75 per cent of the face value the outstanding indebtedness, with interest, now against the project, giving them a 40-year contract for the repayment and leaving the handling of the project in the hands of these people themselves.

Mr. COLLINS. How many other private reclamation projects are there?

Mr. LEAVITT. How many in the United States?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. I do not know.

Mr. COLLINS. And I suppose we will have to take them all over?

Mr. LEAVITT. Oh, no.

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, yes, we will.

Mr. LEAVITT. Suppose we do take them over, will it not be a sounder public policy to save existing communities than to take the reclamation fund and expend it in creating new communities in untried sections of the country, thereby adding greatly to the cultivated acreage of the country?

Mr. COLLINS. I can not see how that is going to help the Public Treasury.

Mr. LEAVITT. This does not come out of the Public Treasury. This does not reach into the Public Treasury. It reaches into the reclamation fund, which is established for the purpose of building these reclamation projects. If it is not used for saving existing projects, it will be used to bring other new projects into existence. In this case it merely saves a community of people and does not add to the cultivated acreage of the country.

Mr. PATTERSON. I recognize the importance of these irrigation projects in the West, having been in the West quite a little. The gentleman gave us some information just now that I was anxious to get, and that is that this does not come out of the Public Treasury, but out of the reclamation fund.

Mr. LEAVITT. It comes from the sale of public lands, oil leases, and so forth, and the fund has been set aside by Congress for that purpose and that purpose only.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a very unusual proposition embodied in this particular bill—H. R. 9990. The bill proposes to appropriate out of the revolving fund available for reclamation \$750,000. There is no difference as to what fund this is drawn from. It is under the control of the Government, and large appropriations have been made by the Government, which make this particular fund available. The fund is also made up from other sources of reve-

nue which come in through the reclamation projects, which makes it a very large revolving fund available annually for the promotion of these irrigation enterprises.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman consider that a fund set apart in the Treasury, of which the Government is only the custodian and which has been set aside definitely for a certain purpose, could properly be used for another purpose? Would the gentleman recommend a course like that as to a fund in a national bank?

Mr. McFADDEN. No; but who ever supposed this crowd would ever go this far—even with a trust fund. I realize that this is a trust fund under the administration of the Department of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Interior takes the word of the Director of Reclamation, but I notice in the report that they have printed the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior and Commissioner Mead. Thus we see how far these men are willing to go. Several years ago private enterprise, "promoters, if you please," financed throughout all parts of the country stock and bond issues to develop get-rich-quick irrigation schemes in the West, in Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, and other States. Nearly all of them went busted.

This happens to be one of those irrigation districts that I know something about. Friends of mine several years ago bought some of these securities, and they lost their money. This is a private enterprise, pure and simple, that the Government is now taking over.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman refer to the first failure or the second instance?

Mr. McFADDEN. I do not know whether it was the first or the second case. It was a failure from its very inception.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the present instance they wanted the Government to take over the bonds of a defunct enterprise that had failed once before.

Mr. McFADDEN. In the last 10 minutes a Member of this House has told me that he had a thousand acres of land in this particular district, and he can not get enough out of it to pay the taxes. I read from the report what took place:

The project began on a speculative basis and the original company failed. The district was then organized and in 1923 sold \$600,000 in bonds bearing interest at 6 per cent to purchase the irrigation system for \$75,000 and replace about half of the old flumes. Present indebtedness is \$577,000 for bonds and \$82,000 for warrants. Irrigation assessments were \$5 an acre in 1927 and 1928, but only 9,644 acres made payment in 1928. Delinquent taxes amount to \$66,000 and the district acquired land through tax sale which amounted to 4,509 acres in 1928. The district is unable to meet its payments to bondholders and secure funds to reconstruct the remainder of the flumes which need rebuilding.

Now, I ask you, gentlemen, whether or not it is the proper thing for the Congress of the United States to take up a defunct private enterprise like this, to say nothing about the merits of carrying on these irrigation propositions? Here is a defunct private enterprise that was a failure from the start. It never did justify itself. It does not justify itself now.

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT] refers to the fact that this is different to what I have been objecting to. It is different in this respect: It is increasing the Government's liability and tying the Government up in taking over a defunct private enterprise; the thing is absolutely defunct. It is not to promote new irrigation, but it is a case of the Government taking over a private defunct enterprise and saving people who have promoted this project a great loss.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman know that the very best project, one of the greatest examples of success in irrigation projects, was a private project?

Mr. McFADDEN. This is the initiation of a new irrigation policy. If this bill is passed it means that all the defunct private irrigation projects will be taken over, involving an increased burden on the taxpayers when the great problem of agriculture in this country now is overproduction. We recently passed a bill creating a Farm Board, with an appropriation of \$500,000,000, to take care of overproduction. It is ridiculous to initiate a program like this.

The gentleman from Montana says this is authorized by other laws. Those of us who are opposed to this kind of thing have to watch carefully to see that something is not frequently slipped over, and especially in the closing days of Congress. I am inclined to believe, with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], that there is great danger in this practice in the closing days of a session of suspending the rules here and passing bills which ought to have more careful consideration. I did not

know about this suspension for this bill until early in the afternoon. It seems to me that Congress should have more time in which to study and consider such bills than is given in the case of this bill. It should never be permitted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think you all know that I have no irrigation problems in my district or in my State, but my committee work has brought me into touch with this reclamation problem for some years past. The reclamation fund was established years ago. The funds were to be derived from the proceeds of the sale of various lands, and leases, and so forth, in the various public-land States and the money is used for the development of those States.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BRIGHAM. The expenditures for irrigation projects are made by appropriation from Federal funds, and was there not originally a considerable appropriation made out of the Treasury to initiate the reclamation program?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. The Government did loan \$20,000,000 for 30 years without interest, to be repaid in 30 years, beginning after 10 years, as I recall, about \$10,000,000 of which has been repaid, and the other sums are repaid as due.

The funds in the main have come from sales of public lands and leases in the public-land States. That fund was set apart and devoted to the development of the West, and it was the expectation to use that in the development of lands owned by the United States; but in the development of the problem under changed conditions it has now reached the point where projects now under consideration and hereafter to be constructed are probably, 90 per cent of them, on privately owned lands.

Now, this bill is a perfectly good bill, under all the circumstances. I want to emphasize to you that the reclamation fund is in the Treasury. It is going to be expended for the development of the West. Whatever the gentleman from Pennsylvania may think about it, or whatever I may think about it, that will be done. It can be done without new legislation, under the existing law, in the building of new projects, even though the lands are privately owned. Whether those lands are developed or undeveloped, it can be done now, and appropriations are authorized.

My friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. McFADDEN, has been vigorous in opposing projects which meant the development of new areas for farming purposes. I am not arguing on that now, because that is not now involved in this proposition at all.

This proposition proposes to take a community in the West where the irrigation district is overburdened with debt, and where new construction is needed, and so adjust their financial conditions as to make it safe for us to advance money for their needed new construction. Now, let us look at it from the point of view of my friend from Pennsylvania for a minute. Let us assume the reclamation fund ought not to be used for new areas. It is going to be used and the gentleman from Pennsylvania and none of the rest of us can stop that. Then, I think my friend from Pennsylvania should be one of the first to welcome a chance for that money to be used in the development of the West, without bringing into cultivation any new acreage.

That is what this bill provides. I think it is better to take that money in a sane, businesslike way and reorganize an existing irrigation district and make it possible for men who are now on the land to succeed rather than to take some unoccupied land and develop it and take a chance on getting settlers to go there and develop the lands.

My friend spoke of somebody owning 1,000 acres. Probably he can afford to own a thousand acres, without regard to whether they make money or not, but the purpose of this irrigation project is to establish American homes. Nonresident owners of land, whether irrigated or otherwise, are never a great influence in the development of any community. Nonresident landlords are not the best kind of landlords for any community. We can not judge as to the success of a project by discussing the results that a man accomplishes by owning land and probably never going there to look at it. What we are concerned about is the men who have been hanging on there for years, trying to make a living, and are in a district that is now overwhelmed with debt. This bill opens the way for the financial matters of that district to be reorganized and then to proceed with the new construction to make this a successful, prosperous community.

I am sure my friend from Pennsylvania never advocates that because a bank is financially embarrassed it should necessarily

be promptly closed and sacrificed at a great loss. He always wants to rejuvenate and save that which can be saved. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Montana to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McFADDEN) there were—ayes 63, noes 15.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 227, noes 53, not voting 148, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—227

Abernethy	Drane	Johnson, Okla.	Ramspeck
Ackerman	Driver	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rankin
Adkins	Dunbar	Johnson, Wash.	Ransley
Allen	Dyer	Kading	Reece
Almon	Eaton, Colo.	Kearns	Rogers
Andrew	Edwards	Kelly	Rowbottom
Arentz	Elliott	Kendall, Ky.	Rutherford
Arnold	Englebright	Kendall, Pa.	Sabath
Aswell	Eslick	Kennedy	Sanders, N. Y.
Auf der Helde	Estep	Kerr	Sandlin
Ayres	Evans, Calif.	Kiefner	Schneider
Bachmann	Evans, Mont.	Knutson	Sears
Bacon	Fish	Kopp	Seger
Baird	Fisher	Korell	Seiberling
Bairdour	Fitzgerald	Kvale	Shaffer, Va.
Beers	French	Lampert	Short, Mo.
Bell	Fuller	Langley	Short, W. Va.
Blackburn	Fulmer	Lankford, Ga.	Shreve
Bloom	Garber, Va.	Lankford, Va.	Simmons
Boylan	Garner	Larsen	Simms
Brand, Ga.	Garrett	Lea	Sloan
Browne	Gasque	Leavitt	Smith, Idaho
Browning	Glover	Luce	Smith, W. Va.
Brumm	Green	Ludlow	Somers, N. Y.
Buckbee	Greenwood	McClintock, Ohio	Sparks
Butler	Gregory	McCormack, Mass.	Spearing
Campbell, Iowa	Griffin	McCormick, Ill.	Steagall
Campbell, Pa.	Hadley	McKeown	Strong, Pa.
Canfield	Hall, Ill.	McLaughlin	Summers, Wash.
Carter, Calif.	Hall, Ind.	Manlove	Swanson
Carter, Wyo.	Hall, Miss.	Mansfield	Swing
Cartwright	Halsey	Mapes	Taylor, Tenn.
Chalmers	Hammer	Mead	Temple
Chase	Hardy	Merritt	Thatcher
Chindblom	Hastings	Michaelson	Thurston
Christgau	Haugen	Michener	Tilson
Christopherson	Hawley	Miller	Treadway
Clancy	Hess	Montague	Tucker
Clark, N. C.	Hickey	Montet	Turpin
Cochran, Mo.	Hill, Ala.	Moore, Ohio	Vestal
Cochran, Pa.	Hill, Wash.	Moore, Va.	Vinson, Ga.
Cole	Hogg	Morehead	Warren
Colton	Holaday	Morgan	Warren
Cooper, Tenn.	Hooper	Mouser	Watres
Cooper, Wis.	Hope	Nelson, Me.	Watson
Corning	Hopkins	Newhall	Welch, Calif.
Coyle	Houston, Del.	Niedringhaus	Whittington
Craddock	Howard	O'Connor, La.	Wilson
Crail	Hudson	O'Connor, Okla.	Wolverton, N. J.
Cramton	Hudspeth	Palmsano	Wolverton, W. Va.
Crisp	Hull, Morton D.	Parker	Wood
Crosser	Hull, William E.	Patterson	Woodrum
Darrow	Hull, Wis.	Perkins	Wright
Davis	Irwin	Pittenger	Wurzbach
Denison	Jeffers	Quin	Wyant
De Rouen	Jenkins	Rainey, Henry T.	Yates
Doxey	Johnson, Nebr.	Ramey, Frank M.	

NAYS—53

Black	Foss	Menges	Snell
Blanton	Garber, Okla.	Milligan	Snow
Box	Goldsborough	Moore, Ky.	Speaks
Brand, Ohio	Hare	Nelson, Mo.	Stafford
Briggs	Hoch	Oldfield	Stone
Brigham	Huddleston	Oliver, Ala.	Sumners, Tex.
Busby	Johnson, Tex.	Palmer	Swick
Cannon	Jones, Tex.	Parks	Tarver
Collins	Lanham	Patman	Tinkham
Connolly	Lozier	Pratt, Ruth	Wigglesworth
Cross	McFadden	Ramseyer	Wolfenden
Culkin	McSwain	Robinson	
Dominick	Magrady	Sanders, Tex.	
Doughton	Martin	Schafer, Wis.	

NOT VOTING—148

Aldrich	Celler	Douglas, Mass.	Golder
Allgood	Clague	Doutrich	Goodwin
Andresen	Clark, Md.	Dowell	Graham
Bacharach	Clarke, N. Y.	Doyle	Granfield
Bankhead	Collier	Drewry	Guyer
Beck	Connery	Eaton, N. J.	Hale
Beedy	Cooke	Ellis	Hall, N. Dak.
Bland	Cooper, Ohio	Esterly	Hancock
Bohn	Cox	Fenn	Hartley
Bolton	Crowther	Finley	Hoffman
Bowman	Cullen	Fitzpatrick	Hull, Tenn.
Britten	Curry	Fort	Igoe
Brunner	Dallinger	Frear	James
Buchanan	Davenport	Free	Johnson, Ill.
Burdick	Dempsey	Freeman	Johnson, Ind.
Burtness	De Priest	Gambrill	Johnston, Mo.
Byrns	Dickinson	Gavagan	Jonas, N. C.
Cable	Dickstein	Gibson	Kahn
Carley	Douglas, Ariz.	Gifford	Kemp

Ketcham.	Maas	Ragon	Taylor, Colo.
Kiess	Mooney	Rayburn	Thompson
Kincheloe	Murphy	Reed, N. Y.	Timberlake
Kinzer	Nelson, Wis.	Reid, Ill.	Underhill
Kunz	Nolan	Romjue	Underwood
Kurtz	Norton	Selvig	Vincent, Mich.
LaGuardia	O'Connell	Sinclair	Wainwright
Lambertson	O'Connor, N. Y.	Sirovich	Walker
Leech	Oliver, N. Y.	Sproul, Ill.	Welsh, Pa.
Lehlbach	Owen	Sproul, Kans.	White
Letts	Peavey	Stallker	Whitehead
Lindsay	Porter	Stedman	Whitley
Linthicum	Pou	Stevenson	Williams
McClintic, Okla.	Prall	Stobbs	Williamson
McDuffie	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Strong, Kans.	Wingo
McLeod	Pritchard	Sullivan, N. Y.	Woodruff
McMillan	Purnell	Sullivan, Pa.	Yon
McReynolds	Quayle	Taber	Zihlman

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Byrns.
Mr. Fenn with Mr. Lindsey.
Mr. Bohn with Mr. Bankhead.
Mr. Aldridge with Mr. Wingo.
Mr. Esterly with Mr. Mooney.
Mr. McLeod with Mr. O'Connell of New York.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Drewry.
Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania with Mr. Pou.
Mr. Frear with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
Mr. Beedy with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Clague with Mr. McDuffie.
Mr. Graham with Mr. Prall.
Mr. Purnell with Mr. Granfield.
Mr. Golder with Mr. Rayburn.
Mr. Beck with Mr. Sullivan of New York.
Mr. Free with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Gibson with Mr. Allgood.
Mr. Reid of Illinois with Mr. Underwood.
Mr. Johnston of Missouri with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Kiess with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Dowell with Mr. Brunner.
Mr. Thompson with Mr. Kincheloe.
Mr. Dallinger with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
Mr. Crowther with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Kunz.
Mr. Pratt, Harcourt J., with Mr. Linthicum.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Whitehead.
Mr. Lehlbach with Mr. McClintic of Oklahoma.
Mr. Kinzer with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Sproul of Illinois with Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts.
Mr. Ketcham with Mr. Igoe.
Mr. Sinclair with Mr. Quayle.
Mr. Underhill with Mr. Cullen.
Mr. Leech with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Nolan with Mr. Carley.
Mr. Freeman with Mrs. Owen.
Mr. Goodwin with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Cable with Mr. Ragon.
Mr. Doutrich with Mr. Sirovich.
Mr. Davenport with Mr. Douglas of Arizona.
Mr. Taber with Mr. Oliver of New York.
Mr. LaGuardia with Mr. Yon.
Mr. Eaton of New Jersey with Mr. McReynolds.
Mr. Brand of Ohio with Mr. Gambrell.
Mr. Walker with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.
Mr. Porter with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Lambertson with Mr. Connery.
Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin with Mr. Gavagan.
Mr. Selvig with Mr. Romjue.
Mr. Sproul of Kansas with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Kurtz with Mr. Stedman.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Fitzpatrick.
Mr. Bolten with Mr. Doyle.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
The doors were opened.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12842) to create an additional judge for the southern district of Florida.

This covers an emergency, created by reason of the death of one of the judges.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 12842, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized, by and with the consent of the Senate, to appoint an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida, who shall reside in said district, and whose compensation, duties, and powers shall be the same as now provided by law for judges of said district.

SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect immediately.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this being the first bill that has been considered of the many on the calendar providing for an additional judge, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee which recommended

these bills whether in all of the bills providing for additional judges the bills have the approval and support of the Attorney General?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Mr. Speaker, I will say that this particular bill has the approval of the Attorney General. The facts are these—

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that in this case there is an exigent reason why this bill should be passed, on account of the death of a judge; but I am seeking to obtain information, because there are 10 or 12 bills which the Committee on the Judiciary has reported, where the reports do not contain a line showing the opinion of the Attorney General, and in some instances lacking the opinion of the local judges as to their need. In many instances the reports show there is no congestion of litigation, no more than in the eastern district of Wisconsin, or not as much. I am trying to ascertain from the gentleman what is the policy of his committee in recommending these bills for additional judges, so that we may use that as a guidepost in our position on the other bills.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. I will say that I can not state offhand just what the Attorney General has said regarding all of these bills, but the bills that have been reported from my subcommittee have the approval of the presiding circuit judge in the particular district.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman submitted the bills over which he has jurisdiction to the Department of Justice for comment?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes; and in some instances the Attorney General simply replied that it had not been before the council of judges and therefore he could not make any recommendations.

Mr. STAFFORD. Since the gentleman says there is an exigency by reason of the death of the judge, I do not intend to object.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. One of the Federal judges passed away on the 7th of this month, and the law under which he had been appointed did not provide for a successor, and none can be appointed until another bill is passed. The Attorney General on June 14 made this statement in regard to this particular case:

The state of the court business in this district renders it highly important that the legislation be enacted before the adjournment of the present session of Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE CHOPTANK RIVER

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 3421, to authorize the Tidewater Toll Properties, (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choptank River at a point at or near Cambridge, Md., a similar bill being on the House Calendar. This bill, as the title indicates, provides for the construction of a bridge across the Choptank River, and it is an emergency measure. The whole Eastern Shore of Maryland is interested in the building of this bridge and the only way we can get it is to pass this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 3421, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), a corporation incorporated under the laws of Maryland, its legal representatives and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Choptank River at or near Cambridge, Md., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Maryland, any political subdivision thereof within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches and any interests in real property necessary therefor, by pur-

chase or condemnation in accordance with the laws of such State governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation. If at any time after the expiration of 20 years after the completion of such bridge and its approaches the same is acquired by condemnation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property; (3) actual financing and promotion cost, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interests in real property; and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

Sec. 3. If such bridge shall at any time be taken over or acquired by any municipality or other political subdivision or subdivisions of the State of Maryland under the provisions of section 2 of this act, and if tolls are charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid for such bridge and its approaches as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of acquiring the bridge and its approaches shall have been provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper care, repair, maintenance, and operation of the bridge and its approaches. An accurate record of the amount paid for the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for operating, repairing, and maintaining the same, and of daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

Sec. 4. The Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, shall, within 90 days after the completion of such bridge, file with the Secretary of War, and with the highway department of the State of Maryland, a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, and at the request of the highway department of the State of Maryland shall, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable costs of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge; for the purpose of such investigation the said Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, shall make available all records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 2 of this act, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

Sec. 5. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

Sec. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SISSETON AND WAHPETON BANDS OF SIOUX INDIANS

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 1372, authorizing an appropriation for payment of claims of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 1372 and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

In line 15, page 1 of the engrossed amendment, after the word "appropriated," insert the following: "Provided further, That before the Secretary of the Interior disburses any part of the appropriation herein authorized except as to compensation to attorneys, agent, or agents, he shall first investigate and determine whether any Indians other than those listed on the rolls as members of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux are members of the same and as such have any right to share

in such appropriation; and in the event he shall so determine, such other Indians shall be included within the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux for the purpose of the distribution of the fund herein provided for."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL HYGIENE EXHIBITION AT DRESDEN, GERMANY

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 2414, authorizing the Government of the United States to participate in the International Hygiene Exhibition at Dresden, Germany, from May 6, 1930, to October 1, 1930, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands this is regarded as a matter of emergency.

Mr. BLOOM. It is an emergency.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 2414, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of permitting the Government of the United States to participate in the International Hygiene Exhibition at Dresden, Germany, May 6, 1930, to October 1, 1930, inclusive, the Surgeon General of the Army, the Surgeon General of the Navy, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service are hereby authorized to send a joint exhibit from their departments, to remain there during the period of the exhibition.

Sec. 2. The sum of \$10,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to defray the expenses of the United States participating in this exhibition.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the words "a joint exhibit" and insert the word "representatives."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman think our representatives will get over there before the exhibition closes? The exhibition is already on, having started May 6, and it closes October 1.

Mr. BLOOM. This bill passed the Senate. There are 20 nations which are participating and the idea is to send representatives from the Health Department so as to go into conference with them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman think they will get over there before the exhibition is terminated?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has been in session for more than a month.

Mr. BLOOM. But they will hold sessions until October 1.

Mr. STAFFORD. If they can get over there before the last day they may be of a little service.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, will the \$5,000 cover the entire cost of this project?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is positive there will not be an additional drain on the Treasury, such as there has been in connection with the George Washington bicentennial project?

Mr. BLOOM. No; there will not be any more than this \$5,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. As far as the George Washington centennial is concerned, it is a local junket, while this is a foreign junket.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will read the hearings on the second deficiency bill, he will find out the outrageous cost of that junket.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have already protested against the outrageous appropriations for that centennial exhibition.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there ought to be some assurance given that the amendments proposed reducing the appropriation from \$10,000 to \$5,000 will not be changed in conference. With that assurance, I shall not object.

Mr. BLOOM. They will not be changed.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are only too happy to get \$5,000 or anything at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE CHICAGO CENTURY OF PROGRESS EXPOSITION

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 353) providing for an investigation and report, by a committee to be appointed by the President, with reference to the representation at and participation in the Chicago World's Fair Centennial Celebration, known as the Century of Progress Exposition, on the part of the Government of the United States and its various departments and activities, which is in the hands of the Clerk and which I ask to be reported for information.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to appoint a committee, consisting of one representative of each of the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, who shall investigate and report to the President, for transmission by him to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the opening of the second regular session of the present Congress, in December, 1930, their conclusions and recommendations with reference to the suitable representation at and participation in the Chicago World's Fair Centennial Celebration, known as the Century of Progress Exposition, at Chicago, Ill., in the year 1933, on the part of the Government of the United States and its various departments and activities.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask my friend one question. I supported the resolution from the Ways and Means Committee authorizing the President to extend invitations to foreign countries to participate in this exposition. What expense does this resolution involve? I ask this question because when we reported the other resolution we were assured that the Government would not be requested to make a national contribution to the exposition.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am very pleased to say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] that when this resolution came up in the Committee on Ways and Means and was unanimously reported by that committee some time ago, I called attention to the resolution which was passed here with reference to the invitation which has now been extended by the President to the nations of the world to participate in this Century of Progress Exposition at Chicago. When that resolution was adopted it was amended on the floor of the House to provide that there should be no commitment for Federal Government expense in connection with the holding of such world's fair, and I am quoting now from the resolution, "other than for suitable representation thereat." This would be the representation at the exposition and the participation therein of the Government itself.

This resolution provides for no expense whatever, not even for the committee. It provides only for the appointment of a committee to consist of representatives of the three departments—the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Commerce—to investigate and report when Congress convenes next December, whether there should be participation in and representation at the Chicago World's Fair on the part of the Government.

Mr. CRISP. Of course I think, if the Government participates, the Government should pay the expenses of its representation.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That question will arise when this committee reports.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman from Illinois assure the Congress it will be safe for the people of the United States and the people of foreign countries to appear in Chicago in 1933?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will racketeering be stopped by that time?

Mr. STAFFORD. We hope conditions will be much improved over existing conditions.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It is safe now, I will say to the gentlemen.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not safe for Milwaukeeans to go through there at present.

Mr. BLANTON. They have had to stop radio reports of police calls in Chicago. We used to have them, but they got so frequent they took up all the radio service.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. On that question I will say that practice was stopped because other means to handle the matter were devised.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is still the Windy City, I may say.

Mr. SABATH. I think the wind is coming from Texas and from Wisconsin now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Off of Lake Michigan.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, the House is anxious, I am sure, to adjourn—

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman will yield to me just a moment, for the information of the gentleman from Texas

and others I want to say that I have just read that the chief of police and the assistant chief of police have resigned to-day. We are going to have real enforcement of all the laws in Chicago.

Mr. STAFFORD. When is the mayor going to resign, which would bring about an efficient city administration?

Mr. SABATH. We are going to elect next spring a Democratic mayor, and then everybody will be safe at all times. [Applause.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I will say that there has been much unjust criticism of the conditions and of the administration of affairs in Chicago. That city, remarkable and outstanding for its growth and progress in many ways, has become the favorite object of attack throughout the country. Making jibes at Chicago has become a national pastime, while the failings of other communities go unnoticed. The truth is, as proven by statistics, that in the number of murders per 100,000 population during 1929 Chicago stood last, at the very bottom, in a list of 39 large American cities located in various parts of the country, and that while Chicago's murder rate actually decreased 20 per cent last year the rates of 127 other American cities, large and small, with a combined population of 36,000,000, actually showed an increase in their murder rate.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the pending House Joint Resolution 353 and developments in connection with the Chicago Century of Progress Exposition in 1933, I quote the following prepared by myself from the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, who unanimously directed me to report the resolution favorably to the House:

On February 5, 1929, President Coolidge approved a joint resolution of Congress authorizing the President to invite the participation of other nations in the Chicago World's Fair Centennial Celebration, to be held at the city of Chicago in the year 1933, whenever it should be shown to the satisfaction of the President that a sum of not less than \$5,000,000 had been raised and was available for the purposes of a world's fair to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of Chicago as a municipality. This joint resolution provided that its passage should not be held to obligate the Government of the United States to any expense in connection with the holding of such world's fair "other than for suitable representation thereat." This provision was inserted in the resolution upon the suggestion and at the request of the representatives of the Chicago World's Fair as it was not intended or desired that the Federal Government should contribute any portion of the expense properly chargeable to the exposition itself.

In pursuance of the joint resolution, President Hoover on November 6, 1929, issued a proclamation in which he stated that it had been shown to his satisfaction that the requisite sum of \$5,000,000 had been raised and made available to the corporation whose name had been changed to "A Century of Progress" and that the board of trustees had "obtained the assistance of men eminent in science and industry to aid in presenting those historic inventions and symbols which demonstrate the progress and the modern spirit underlying industry and agriculture, and in general to present exhibits showing advancement in the industrial and fine arts."

The President further expressed his belief that "the people of many nations would be pleased to unite with the people of the United States in the celebration of a century of progress and of the centenary of Chicago, itself an outstanding example of the great and rapid changes this century has produced." The President, therefore, in compliance with the joint resolution of Congress, invited "the participation of the nations in this exposition of a century of progress, to the end that there may be shown in Chicago examples of contributions made to that progress by the peoples of many nations; and in order that the achievements and inventions of the great men of the world in science, in art, in drama, and in sport as well as in industry and agriculture, may be fittingly acknowledged and acclaimed."

In response to this invitation of our Government, great interest has been shown among the nations of the world, and among the States of the Union to participate in the exposition. It is clear, however, that an exposition of the world's progress during the last hundred years in art, science, industry, agriculture, transportation, drama, sport, and other activities would not be complete without a demonstration of the contributions of our National Government and an exhibition of many articles in its possession showing the vast participation of that Government itself in all the things that have made the last century one of marvelous advancement. It is felt by the management of the Chicago exposition that the nature and extent of this representation and participation should be determined by the Federal Government itself.

In order to start this movement the pending joint resolution was introduced. It authorizes and requests the President to appoint a committee consisting of one representative of each of the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, who shall investigate and report to the President for transmission by him to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the opening of the next regular session of Congress in December, 1930, their conclusions and recommendations with refer-

ence to the suitable representation at and participation in the Century of Progress Exposition at Chicago on the part of the Government of the United States and its various departments and activities.

When the report of this committee is received in December it is hoped and expected that Congress will be in position to determine what further legislation should be passed in order to provide opportunity for exhibits in the control of the various Government departments to be added to those of private exhibitors and of other nations, for the purpose of showing the Federal Government's participation in and relation to the progress of mankind and of the people of the United States especially during the century which has passed since Chicago was incorporated as a village with 28 white inhabitants in 1833.

The Century of Progress Exposition at Chicago, as the proposed world's fair is now called, will cover an area of approximately 1,000 acres, including a lagoon of 200 acres. It is located on the shore of Lake Michigan in the heart of the city. Already included in this area are such outstanding institutions as the Chicago Art Institute, the Field Museum, the Adler Planetarium, the Shedd Aquarium, and the Soldiers Field Stadium, all of which will be utilized for purposes of the exposition.

The plans for the selection and grouping of exhibits have been committed to the National Research Council, which for that purpose has appointed a general advisory committee of 57 members divided into three groups, consisting of the executive committee of 7 members, 34 technical and professional members who have the responsibility of preparing the programs in their respective fields, and 16 members at large who are advisors in general. Each of the 34 technical and professional members is chairman of a subcommittee, assigned to a particular subject, thus, for instance, the subcommittee on anthropology has a membership of 4, while the subcommittee on electrical engineering has a membership of 49. The total membership of the subcommittees at this time is 409. Agriculture and transportation have been placed in the foreground in the plans for exhibits. Numerous congresses and conventions, of great interest to the Federal Government, as well as to the general public, will be held during the exposition, and an elaborate program is being arranged for the exhibition of sports and games.

The physical work of the preparation of the grounds and the erection of buildings for the exposition is well under way, and it is expected that most of the buildings will be available for occupancy a half year before the opening of the fair.

It is expected that the reports of the general advisory committee and its subcommittees of the National Research Council, together with all the plans of the exposition corporation, will be submitted to the committee whose appointment is provided in the pending resolution, and that the proposed investigation will in every way be facilitated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEFA T. PHILIPS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, because it is an emergency matter, for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 12586.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there is an emergency involved and recognizes the gentleman for this purpose.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Josefa T. Philips, widow of John Philips, rear admiral, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$300 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$300" and insert "\$100."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, we are going into the Private Calendar in a few days and I object for the time being.

Mr. STAFFORD subsequently said: Mr. Speaker, I interposed an objection to the bill H. R. 12586 a few moments ago. I am advised that the circumstances are such that even another day may bring great need to this indigent widow, and I therefore withdraw the objection that I interposed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LXXII—690

SPEECH OF O. H. P. SHELLEY, OF MONTANA

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by O. H. P. Shelley, Republican candidate for United States Senator from Montana, delivered at Billings, Mont., over Station KGHl on Tuesday evening at 6 o'clock, May 27, 1930:

CAUSES OF STOCK-MARKET CRASHES AND DEPRECIATIONS—FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM AND WORLD BANK

In choosing between myself and Judge Galen as the Republican nominee for Senator the Republicans of Montana will have an opportunity to express themselves for or against the league court, for or against foreign entanglements which would sacrifice the independence, safety, and prosperity of the United States in behalf of supposed world interests.

Promoters of the League of Nations, having been defeated so often and so decisively in their efforts to drag America into the league, have now unanimously turned to the job of putting over the league court, knowing that once we are in this organ of the league, the task of dragging us out of the vestibule of the league into the league itself will be easy.

Judge Galen has not only signed a petition for the league court but he was one of the signers of the demand on the American delegation to the London Disarmament Conference, cooked up by a group of pro-league leaders in New York City, accusing our delegation in effect of a failure to go far enough in sacrificing American interests at this conference, and advocating our entry into a consultative pact which would have exposed this country to the danger of becoming involved in future European wars. It is well known that this cable with a thousand names attached, worked up at a cost of several thousand dollars by proleaguers, greatly embarrassed the American delegation at London. Up to that time no European nation had asked that the United States enter such a consultative arrangement, but this cablegram made it appear to the foreign delegations that the American people were asking it, whereas 90 per cent of our people are against binding this country to agreements which threaten us with being involved in foreign wars. The text of this cablegram with Judge Galen's name attached, was published in the New York Times under date of March 3 of this year.

In other words, Judge Galen showed by his action before he became a candidate for United States Senator, that he is an internationalist. It is well known what is behind this effort to involve this country in European leagues and tribunals, where this country would have 1 voice in more than 50 in determining questions affecting our national peace and welfare. The reasons behind this effort to involve us in foreign leagues and tribunals are business reasons. They grow out of the fact that American international bankers and industrialists have invested abroad, especially in Europe, billions of dollars which might better have gone for the development of the United States. Their hearts have followed their treasure into foreign lands. Meanwhile the vast resources of States like ours remain undeveloped for lack of capital.

The purpose of these internationalists is to pool American credit with foreign credit to stabilize foreign countries in order that American international capitalists may exploit European countries and people for their own profit, and for the opportunity to do this they are willing to sacrifice American interests and safety and expose the youth of Montana to the danger of being compelled to fight foreign wars to protect investments abroad.

I am in favor of friendly cooperation with other nations to reduce armaments within the border line of safety and for other mutually helpful purposes. But I am not in favor of sacrificing the Monroe doctrine or submitting any other question involving our just national interests to any foreign league or tribunal for settlement. For us to submit such questions as the Monroe doctrine, immigration, and tariffs to foreign adjudication is to imperil our prosperity and safety.

Back of all this movement to involve us politically in the European system is the plan of our international bankers and industrialists to bring the American standard of wages and living down to that of Europe, Asia, and South America, and thus to reduce our farmers and workers to the same status of peasantry they occupy in most of the rest of the world. I say that the billions we are investing abroad must not be protected by the sacrifice of the life and treasure of the millions of Americans who are content to contribute to the prosperity of their own country rather than engage in foreign financial adventures and cash in on them at our expense.

I think the time has come when our Government should focus itself on the job of promoting the prosperity of our own people. The present condition of unemployment in industry and depression of agriculture is due to too much attention to foreign necessities and too little to our own. Through an abuse of the Federal reserve system big finance bankrupted the American farmer in 1920-21. After encouraging the farmers to expand to the limit in their production during the World War, and encouraging the banks to extend credit to the limit to the farmers, the Federal Reserve Board compelled a sudden liquidation,

which broke the banks and the farmers and brought on the whole train of troubles which have pursued the farmers since. The rest of the world was clamoring for cheap food, and it will be recalled that Secretary of the Treasury Glass, in his correspondence with Food Administrator Hoover after the World War, gave that as his reason for asking Hoover to quit resisting the European demand for canceling contracts for American pork and other foodstuffs. The farmer was made the goat of a sudden deflation, which was perhaps the most outrageous single act of a Government agency in our history.

More recently the Federal Reserve Board has made American industry the victim of a single series of manipulations in the interests of European credit, which caused the stock-market crash and the present industrial depression. These manipulations, as shown by the columns of the public press, began in February, 1929, with a visit to this country of the governor of the Bank of England and his consultation with the Federal Reserve Board heads, the subject of these conferences being anxiety as to the financial situation in Great Britain and the fall of the pound sterling. Three billion dollars of French and British capital had been invested in the American stock market, and the purpose was to stop the drain of gold to the United States by breaking American security values. The first effort in March, 1929, caused by public proclamations of the Federal Reserve Board calculated to scare investors, caused a minor panic in March. The second effort, beginning in August, 1929, was made through sales and short sales of British and French investors and by American international bankers and caused the panic of October. An investigation by Congress would show the concerted action by which this blow was inflicted. It was accomplished by manipulations of the discount rate by our Federal Reserve Board and the Bank of England intended to hasten the crash. It is true that this crash was made possible by excessive speculation and inflation, but that speculation and inflation were created chiefly by the Federal Reserve Board inflation and driving up of security prices to perilous heights by the international investors and bankers preliminary to pulling the board out from under.

The Federal Reserve Board is now asking Congress to take the Secretary of the Treasury off the Federal Reserve Board and remove it further from control by the people through their Government. It is trying to set itself up as a financial and industrial supergovernment. Through the world bank our international financiers are seeking further to make credit and prosperity of the United States dependent on conditions abroad. They are preparing to market in this country hundreds of millions of additional securities, including reparation bonds, thus draining out of the United States more money needed for our own development and implicating us further in the European economic and financial situation. Instead of less control over the Federal reserve system I am in favor of more control.

I am against the draining of the money of our people into great centers through the chain-bank system, and the draining of the money out of our financial centers into Europe to build up their competition against us, based on cheap-labor costs. I am against the reduction of our standards of living to meet lower foreign standards. I am against the sacrifice of American prosperity to promote foreign prosperity and stability. This purpose is now being proclaimed in veiled language by our international bankers. There may be money in it for them, but to the American people it means only more blows at their prosperity such as were aimed at them by this same element in 1920 and 1929. And to the rest of the world it will bring no benefit except to a few financiers who are in on the deal, and it will put a premium on the continuance of cheap-labor standards.

There is no excuse whatever for the unemployment we now have in the United States, no excuse for the hard times which have come upon the farmer, except the manipulations of these international bankers who are financing the movement in this country to get us into the League of Nations, the World Court, the world bank, and similar institutions to which we are to contribute the assets and from which we are to take the liabilities. We have a new world of our own on this continent, a new political world based on principles of justice to the masses, which have not prevailed in the old world. Let the rest of the world climb to our level by the use of the principles we have employed here to make what of a right ought to be a country of increasing prosperity and social welfare. Let them not ask us, through the international bankers and industrialists, to come down to their level. Indeed, this country's social fabric will not withstand the strain of such a degradation, and unless this conspiracy against American standards of life is halted our country will go on the rocks.

I promise the people of Montana that if elected Senator I will fight with all my might against the schemes of international bankers and industrialists to reduce our country to the economic level of the rest of the world and sacrifice our independence in working out the high destiny of our people. Whether their program be the League of Nations, the League Court, the World Bank, the creation here of a financial and industrial supergovernment which will crush out the independent farmer, merchant, and manufacturer, which will tear down the protective-tariff barriers behind which alone we can hope to survive in the fight for the maintenance of our standards of wages and living

against coolie, peasant, and peon standards, I shall be against them every step of the way.

This is the most important issue before the American people. Beside it all others sink into insignificance. We can make no progress along the lines of social reform or betterment if our people are to be reduced to the level of poverty for the masses accepted in the Old World. Millions of our people have come here from Europe to seek better conditions of life. They do not propose now to be dragged down to the European and Asiatic level in order that a few men here may make greater profits temporarily. It is time that we should rally around a new Declaration of Independence and fight for the right of the American people to enjoy the heritage which has come down to them under institutions which make the measure of national prosperity the degree of comfort, luxury, and opportunity in which the average man can live. We are asked to turn aside from the national and international policies which have made this the most prosperous land in the world. For a dozen years we have been witnessing the disastrous effects of turning our backs on those policies. Let us turn back from the swamp into which we are invited to the solid ground upon which Washington and Lincoln, Roosevelt, and McKinley stood. Upon our ability to do this against the great financial influences which seek to lead our people astray depends our ability to make and keep America the promised land of opportunity for common men.

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HEALTH

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks on the bill S. 1171. I desire to include therein an article written by Hudson Grunewald in the Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, by the enactment into law of Senate bill No. 1171, this Congress has made it possible for the Government to perform a too-long-deferred duty to our country and to its people. Although much important legislation has been enacted at this session of Congress, with the passage of time it may well transpire that the greatest legislative achievement of this session of the Seventy-first Congress will prove to be the enactment of this legislation creating the National Institute of Health.

Disraeli, the greatest statesman of his day, and one of the great statesmen of all times, speaking on the subject of health, said this:

Public health is the foundation upon which rest the happiness of the people and the power of the State. Take the most beautiful kingdom, give it intelligent and laborious citizens, prosperous manufactures, productive agriculture; let arts flourish, let architects cover the land with temples and palaces; in order to defend all these riches, have first-rate weapons, fleets of torpedo boats—if the population remains stationary, if it decreased yearly in vigor and in stature, the nation must perish. And that is why I consider that the first duty of a statesman is the care of public health.

Our very natural and human attitude of taking things for granted had long existed among our people generally in reference to the problem of public health. However, when through our entry into the World War it became necessary to draft many millions of our young men for military service, this attitude of indifference and ignorance to our health conditions received a rude and awakening shock. Since then we have been more or less alive to the vital problem involved in the matter of nation-wide ill health. It became obvious to all that if a large percent of our young men—in those years when health and vigor is at its height—were not in physical health, fit to enter the military service, then we were not the sound, virile, healthy people that we considered ourselves to be.

Good health at once became one of the vital elements of our military strength. This was recognized by all. It is now recognized that in many aspects and from many standpoints it is really a more vital and serious problem to be solved for the strength of our Nation and the well-being of our people in times of peace.

It is this recognition that has lifted the question of public health into the arena of national importance and made it a matter to be met and dealt with as a constitutional duty of our Government—to promote the general welfare.

Then, too, our Government's obligation to the sick and disabled veterans has been met by a national hospitalization policy and program on a large scale. This has further knitted the health problem of our people into the national policy of our Government.

I find it impossible to discuss the matter of public health without paying a brief tribute of the admiration, respect, and deep sense of obligation which I feel to the medical profession. And among the thousands who have slaved for science, who have often sacrificed their lives to save others, who, without any

thought of the great personal risk to themselves, have treated patients with infectious and contagious diseases, who have risked their lives in laboratories doing research work in attempting to discover the cause and cure of these diseases.

We have all been the beneficiaries of the work and service of this great profession. We would pay the highest tribute to the brave men who took the mass of superstition and tradition and guesswork and by applying to this whole field the scientific method as brought therefrom for all the race, its greatest boon of modern scientific medicine.

One of the greatest and earliest pioneers in this movement was not even a member of the medical profession. He was a chemist. But through his years of devoted service, his inspired foresight, he has now become in our memory one of the great "saints of science." I refer, of course, to Pasteur, who, with little or no public funds and with much of the opposition of the orthodox public opinion of his day, toiled on in his little attic laboratory without any laboratory equipment except that which he designed and made with his own hands. But from that humble laboratory, through his devotion and service in fighting disease, has flowed throughout the medical profession the health-giving and healing water of his sacrificial and devoted service. From the practical standpoint it was Pasteur who discovered the origin of germs and that they were the cause of disease, and more important than this, that germs were everywhere. It was the application of his discovery by the great Doctor Lister, who applied the principles in the use of antiseptics in the operating room and sick room, that made possible modern surgery.

Pasteur's tender heart was touched by the heavy toll of human life that was caused by childbirth. He saw that all too often the door that opened to bring life to the new-born babe was an open door to the tomb for its mother—that all too often, and too soon, the tender arms that embraced the new-born babe were forever stilled in death—and that the ravages of childbirth fever were due to germs; that the surgeon's hands, the instruments, the nurses' hands, bandages, dressings, and everything used in the sick room must be sterilized to destroy the germ life.

The best-known result of his many experiments is his isolating the germ which caused rabies and of perfecting the serum which has proved to be a cure for hydrophobia.

But greater than all of Pasteur's experiments and the results flowing therefrom was this: His greatest achievement was that he established the scientific method, which has since been adopted and followed by the medical profession and from which has flowed all its great contributions with its blessings and its benefits to the race, in the discovery of the cause and cure of the ills to which human flesh is heir.

The medical profession has in recent years been giving more recognition to the importance of mental states in the cause and treatment of that wide range of human ills which exist where there is no organic disorder. They have recognized that in many such cases the disease is in the patient's personality and the treatment must be administered to the whole personality.

But there are many people who go far beyond the definite limits of this field, fixed and recognized by the medical profession, and who say that all disease is a matter of the mind. They go further and not only deny the existence of physical disease as a scientific fact but sincerely and vigorously deny the power of the medical profession to successfully treat such diseases. Their sincerity and devotion to their belief is shown by the fact that they will lie on their deathbed and not consult a physician or subject themselves to medical treatment. And they will let those who are near and dear to them "pass out" without asking medical science to try and save them.

If I were such a person, holding such a belief, I could not, of course, support such legislation as created the National Health Institute, for the obvious reason that I did not believe that there is any such thing as organic physical disease and that the medical profession could not do anything in the cure or treatment of the same. And to support such legislation would be to surrender my sincerest convictions and to foist upon the people a palpable fraud practiced by well-meaning but mistaken imposters.

Believing, however, as I do in medical science and recognizing as I do its great contributions in the curing of disease and the prolongation of human life, I can and do support such legislation whole-heartedly, with enthusiasm, and with a feeling that I have done my bit in causing the Nation, through this cooperation with the medical profession, to make a great and further contribution to human health.

I am thankful again that I am not one of those who believes neither in organic physical disease nor in the power of scientific medicine to cope with it, when I am asked to deal with legislation authorizing Government hospitals for the care and treatment of our sick and disabled veterans, because were I such a person I could not support such legislation and appropriate

millions of Government funds for hospitals, doctors, and nurses to care for our sick and disabled veterans who sacrificed their health in defense of their country in its hour of need—for the very obvious reason that, believing as I did, that there was no disease and no disability and that the medical profession and hospitals could offer no relief, I could not honestly support such a policy and authorize such an expenditure of the public funds. But I am glad again that my admiration and respect for the medical profession, and my recognition of their great service in dealing with the sick and disabled veterans causes me to support all hospitalization legislation with enthusiasm.

And yet, again, were I one of those who did not believe in the existence of physical disease, I would again come face to face with the insurmountable obstacle of such a belief when it became my duty, as Congressman, to vote large Government funds either as pensions or compensation for sick and disabled veterans. How could I, if I did not believe that there was any such thing as sickness and physical disability, vote to pay men for something that did not exist? If I thought they were not disabled, but only suffering from a mental error, they would not need a pension. All they would need would be to change their minds.

But knowing as I do that our veterans have been wounded and disabled by the thousands, and are sick and suffering by the tens of thousands, I find myself anxious to do my duty as a Congressman in voting in favor of sound legislation, doing justice to all, and not a few, of those who fought our battles "over there," appropriating funds from the Government Treasury to pay these men just compensation and pensions for their illness and disability.

The striking contrast which I have tried to show in the realm of national life can be brought home to everyone if I give you what the pictures would term a "close-up." How many of you have lived in a community where the school board tried to enforce vaccination requirements to prevent the spread of small pox or some other contagious disease, and witnessed the strongest possible opposition and refusal to comply with the regulations on the part of those sincere people who did not believe either in the existence of disease or in anything that the medical profession had to say or proposed to do about it. But not only has this arisen in the school situation, but in local communities, and even in States where legislation authorizing quarantine regulations was proposed or where authorities attempted to enforce quarantine. They have found the law opposed and evaded firmly, sincerely, and vigorously by people who do not believe in the existence of physical disease, and do not believe in medical science's ability to restrict the spread of the same through the enforcement of quarantine regulations.

The creation of the National Institute of Health is a great step, but it is only the first step. Before this Congress adjourns I wish the committee would report out and we would enact into law the Cooper bill—H. R. 12845—which has for its purpose Federal aid to the State in coordinating public-health activities and in setting up and training an adequate local personnel to deal with local health problems. Unless this or similar legislation becomes a law, much of the valuable results of the research and work of the National Institute of Health will lie dormant. What we need is these local health agencies to take out among our people, and into our homes, the benefits and blessings of the new achievements of medical science through the National Health Institute, with the better methods of hygiene to be explained and given to our people.

If we are to overcome disease and ill health, the battle must be won in the local community and in the home. It can not be met by "long-distance" treatment from Washington.

Under the leave given me I now desire to insert in the RECORD an article entitled "War Declared on Disease," from the able pen of Mr. Hudson Grunewald, which was published in the Washington Star on June 15, 1930. This article not only pays fitting tribute to Senator RANDELL, the distinguished author of the bill, but it is a concise and fair statement of the purposes and the hoped-for achievement of the National Health Institute:

[From the Washington Star, June 15, 1930]

WAR DECLARED ON DISEASE—CAPITAL TO BE CENTER OF BIGGEST FIGHT EVER WAGED UNDER PLANS APPROVED BY CONGRESS

By Hudson Grunewald

The passage of the Ransdell bill to establish a National Institute of Health in Washington, D. C., marks the beginning of a new chapter in the history of medicine; a new contribution by the United States to medical knowledge of the most far-reaching influence in the relief of human suffering. A veritable declaration of war against all the physical forces detrimental to health on a greater scale than ever before attempted, this bill centers in the Nation's Capital all of the country's

medical and scientific resources for the combating of disease, and creates in Washington a clearing house of health for all the world.

Here, under a commander in chief, will be marshaled the Nation's army of experts in the sciences of medicine, surgery, chemistry, physics, biology, bacteriology, pharmacology, pharmacy, dentistry, and allied professions in a concerted drive to prevent disease by ascertaining its cause and applying preventive measures in advance of its outbreak.

Here in the Nation's Capital will be founded an institution devoted solely to the study, investigation, and research in problems relating to the health of man, where every available facility will be provided to aid and encourage scientists to combat illness and to solve the many remaining mysteries of disease, and where all medical knowledge and every advance in the promotion of human health will be pooled and correlated for the benefit of mankind.

PLANNED ON RECORD SCALE

Here will be begun new researches in cancer on a greater scale than ever before attempted; new investigations into the cause and cure of infantile paralysis and heart disease; new studies of influenza and pneumonia. Here for the first time the scientists of an entire Nation will unite in a mass attack against the common cold and against other widespread maladies to which all are heir. Here will be made new discoveries; new and better methods of cure and treatment will be found to replace those now in use, and new and greater safeguards of health will be devised.

No institution has ever been founded anywhere in the world for the combating of disease on so large a scale, and there is no means of foretelling what may be its eventual benefits to humanity.

The bill has been termed "the most forward step ever taken by the American Government." And it affords the United States "the unique opportunity to give to our country a new and powerful weapon for attack on the greatest problems of maintenance of health and cure of disease which is not duplicated or equaled elsewhere."

"While war claims its sacrifices in millions of lives," declared Senator JOSEPH E. RANDELL (Democrat), of Louisiana, author of the bill, "disease each year claims its tens of millions. * * * Can we not use for the solution of these problems the same methods so successfully employed in the solution of means of making war? The experience of the ages is now being drawn upon in this fight against disease, but the means are entirely inadequate, as shown by the continued ravishment of disease."

"United efforts of the Navy, the Infantry, Artillery, Cavalry, Air Service, etc., is now the self-understood method of campaign against an enemy," Dr. Julius Stieglitz, of the University of Chicago, has pointed out. "Similarly, a campaign against disease, against invading microbes, and disorganized body functions will give the greatest promise of success in an institution that can continuously call upon eminent men in the fields of science studying disease to give their whole service to the planning and execution of the campaign against these deadly enemies to the life of our people."

CONTAINS THREE FEATURES

The definite object of the Randell bill is to promote the health of human beings, to improve their earning capacity, to reduce their living expenses, to increase their happiness, and prolong their lives. It has unselfish interests to serve, and its beneficent results will enter every home in the Nation.

The bill contains three distinct features:

First: The creation of a National Institute of Health in the Public Health Service under the administrative direction and control of the Surgeon General, for the special purpose of pure scientific research to ascertain the cause, prevention, and cure of diseases affecting human beings. It does not create any new bureaus or new commissions but utilizes existing Government machinery and provides for such enlargement of the Hygienic Laboratory which is merged in and made an essential part of the national institute. It authorizes the appropriation of \$750,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for construction and equipment of additional buildings at the present Hygienic Laboratory of the Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.

Second: It authorizes the Treasury Department to accept gifts unconditionally for study, investigation, and research in problems relating to the health of man and matters pertaining thereto, with the proviso that if gifts in the sum of half a million dollars or more are made, the name of the donor shall be attached thereto.

Third: It proposes the establishment and maintenance in the institute of a system of fellowships in scientific research in order to secure the proper personnel and to encourage and aid men and women of marked proficiency to combat the diseases that menace human health.

The main purpose of the bill as reported is "to arouse our people to the imperative necessity and wisdom of preventing the innumerable diseases that affect humanity and of making life more comfortable and happy by assuring good health, the greatest of temporal blessings." The practical effect of the legislation would be to enlarge the work of the Public Health Service and to enable it to fulfill a larger field in public-health research.

"There are millions of sufferers from painful, consuming disease," says Senator RANDELL, "such as the common cold, about the nature, origin, and cure of which little or nothing is known, and which causes

more deaths and economic waste than any other, as influenza, before which modern medicine remains impotent; measles, the offending organisms of which have not as yet been definitely proven; pneumonia, which is still unconquered; tuberculosis and cancer, which baffle the skill of scientists; child-bed sickness so fatal to mothers; infantile paralysis, which remains a curse to childhood; Bright's disease, which is so prevalent among adult men; anemia, mental troubles, heart lesions, and venereal diseases, all of which take heavy toll of human life. Leprosy, life's greatest tragedy, is only slowly being conquered. A great deal has been done recently in a scientific way to conquer malaria, but if, too, is not thoroughly understood. A vast amount of research work is awaiting the attention of scientists in the field of medicine and its application for the alleviation of suffering."

EXPERTS TO WORK TOGETHER

"There should be one place in the United States where unceasing efforts are being made to conquer disease," Senator COPELAND, of New York, told the committee, to which the bill was referred. "It is pathetic to think that infantile paralysis, influenza, and pneumonia are just as fatal to-day as they were a century ago. There must be found means of controlling those dread diseases. The Randell bill will help to accomplish this."

The plan of the institute is to make of it a great cooperative, scientific organization in which leading experts in every branch of science will be brought together and given opportunity to work in unison for the purpose of discovering all the natural laws governing human life, and especially to learn those variations of such laws which are detrimental to human health.

The bill authorizes the use of the site now occupied by the Hygienic Laboratory and adjacent lands owned by the Government for suitable and adequate buildings for the use of the institute as well as the acquisition of additional sites in or near the District of Columbia.

Public health investigations by the Federal Government were first authorized in 1901. "Since then," states the committee report, "commendable progress has been made and many new facts discovered which have had an important bearing on the control of disease. The necessity for this work far outstripped the facilities for its conduct."

Reid Hunt, of the Harvard University Medical School, told the committee that "never in the whole history of the world have the efforts to improve health conditions been so far behind the advance in other sciences. The applications to public health are certainly lagging, simply because there are no good places to study them as they should be studied."

Pointing to the fact that the United States has lagged behind in medico-scientific advances because of its lack of adequate research facilities, such as the National Institute of Health will provide, the report showed that the big advances made in medicine in the past 60 or 70 years, with a few outstanding exceptions, have been of foreign origin, and the roots of many of them have been in the German laboratories, supported by the German Government.

"The first duty of the State is the care of the health of its citizens," said Dr. W. J. Mayo in a letter read before the committee. "By means of public health measures in the last 60 years the average life of man has been prolonged 12 years. This extraordinary result has been brought about through researches by medical men and has been possible only through the cooperative labor of many investigators. The physician in his ministrations applies for the benefit of his patients the best which science offers."

"The public-health movement has demonstrated with complete assurance that, at the present time, with all of our health advances, hundreds of thousands of lives are sacrificed to ignorance and neglect, and that the total economic money value of these lives is close to \$6,000,000,000," Louis I. Dublin, statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., stated in a letter to Senator RANDELL. "Preventable disease, likewise, costs us well over \$2,000,000,000 a year. These are the stakes for which the public-health program is playing."

The scope of work coming under the National Institute of Health is very great. An idea as to some of the problems awaiting solution is clearly set out in a recent study made by the Public Health Service of the cases of sickness in a typical small town and reported to the committee. Translated into terms of the population of the United States it is shown that the number of persons suffering from minor sicknesses in 1927 were as follows:

Colds and bronchitis.....	50,232,000
Influenza and gripe.....	17,184,000
Diseases of the digestive system.....	11,589,000
Tonsillitis and sore throat.....	7,884,000
Diseases of the nervous system, including headaches.....	5,292,000
Measles.....	4,104,000
Whooping cough.....	2,712,000
Rheumatism and lumbago.....	2,616,000
Heart and other circulatory diseases.....	2,196,000
Hay fever and asthma.....	600,000

MAJOR DISEASES EXCLUDED

"It must be remembered that these figures do not touch on the more dreaded diseases, such as cancer, tuberculosis, etc.," says the report. "Furthermore, it should give rise to serious thought when we read from the report of Dr. George T. White, secretary and manager of the

Association of Life Insurance Presidents, that while the death rate among policyholders of the 52 legal-reserve life-insurance companies was 828 per 100,000 policyholders in 1921, nevertheless, the corresponding figures for 1927 were 823.5, a decrease of only 4.5 deaths per 100,000, which is equivalent to a decrease of only 0.045 of 1 per cent, and this in spite of all the wonderful developments in science during that period of 6 years."

The system of fellowships for researches of demonstrated proficiency, as provided in the bill, is regarded as a most important one. These fellowships would offer inducement and opportunity for those specially qualified in this line of research to serve their fellow men in the most useful of all ways. While it is contemplated that the bulk of this research work will be carried out in the laboratories in Washington nevertheless it is not so limited, for under the terms of the bill these "fellows" could be assigned to a definite problem in educational or endowed institutions in any other part of this or other countries, wherever it would be most advantageous for the problem to be worked upon. The existence of these fellowships will direct the attention of the young men and women of our universities, and even those in our high schools, to the desirability of equipping themselves for lifetime work in this most important of all fields of applied science.

In discussing these fellowships Surgeon Kerr, of the United States Public Health Service, declared:

"The most valuable asset of the people of the country is brains, and, from my experience in college and university life, I know there are young men, have been young men, and I know there must be now, who, by reason of lack of finances and lack of encouragement and the inaccessibility of a scientific environment in which to develop, have fallen by the wayside. Now, the purpose of a measure of this kind should be to have potentially available a provision whereby a young man could be aided, not for a few days or a few weeks, to finish his education, as the universities have some funds of that character, but to aid him, after he has graduated, providing he is an extraordinary student."

Concerning the matter of gifts and donations to the National Institute of Health, Senator RANDELL said:

"In the field of public health no precedent can be recalled of donations from philanthropists to enable the Federal Government to maintain laboratories and institutions for the promotion of research with possibly one exception. The Smithsonian Institution was founded as the result of the gift of one man. It stands as a monument to his name, and its achievements are known throughout the world.

"With the highest respect for Smithsonian and full appreciation of the great work accomplished by the Smithsonian Institution and the bureaus directed by it, I believe that the citizens of America would have derived infinitely more practical benefit had he left his endowment for an establishment to study the diseases of man, to relieve human suffering, and prolong human life. * * * I can not suggest anything to the millionaires of America, many of whom are earnestly seeking some wise use for their wealth, that will do as much good to humanity as to contribute generously to their Federal Government for public-health purposes in combating disease.

"A great chemico-medical laboratory, fully equipped to cope with all diseases that afflict mankind, where he can carry on his important work fruitfully and in an unlimited way is the need of the American scientist. Our lagging in the matter of medical research has not been the result of the inefficient mentality of our scientist, but, on the contrary, the lack of facilities and the discouraging insufficiency of funds to stimulate recruits in science."

What results will be accomplished by the national institute of health, which will be perhaps the greatest single agency ever formed for the combating of disease, can hardly be visualized.

MEASURE OFFERED IN 1926

"Encouraged by this Government," Dr. Arthur McCormack, State health officer of Kentucky, declared, "it absolutely startles one's imagination to contemplate the resulting benefits to humanity that can be accomplished."

The passage of this bill is the realization of a dream come true for Senator RANDELL and is the third great humanitarian measure he has put through, being the author of the bill to establish the National Leprosarium at Carville, La., where lepers are to-day being cured, and having fathered the bill to eradicate Texas fever.

Senator RANDELL first introduced the measure on July 1, 1926, and for nearly four years he has applied himself unceasingly and untiringly and with undiminished enthusiasm toward the realization of his ideal. The suffering of humanity throughout the centuries has impelled him in his efforts, the great need of his country's physicians and scientists for such a measure to aid them in their battle against suffering, and his patriotic desire to make the United States a leader in this movement of such vast benefit to countless millions in the ages to come has urged him on.

Many men of vision and love for their fellows have assisted him in doing the educational work necessary for the proper understanding of the measure by Congress. "It is impossible to name them all," he says, "but I can not refrain from mentioning President Hoover, ex-President Coolidge, Andrew Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, and Francis P. Garvan, president of the Chemical Foundation. These four great Amer-

icans saw with clear eyes the possibilities of this health institute for preventing or curing disease, with its awful suffering and colossal economic losses not only to our country but to the whole world. They and many others gave their whole-hearted support to the bill.

Since the passage of the measure Senator RANDELL has been flooded with letters of praise and congratulatory messages, and newspapers throughout the United States have paid him tribute in commendatory editorials.

The time has come to recognize the silent men of medicine and science who are every day accomplishing heroic victories in the warfare against disease and human suffering. There have been greater generals in the laboratories, in the operating rooms, and in the wards of hospitals than any who have won glory on battle fields. Senator RANDELL has paved the way for this recognition in the National Institute of Health in Washington. Here will arise a Napoleon of science, a George Washington of health. But to Senator RANDELL will go first honors for this great humanitarian measure, and the institute he has founded will be a lasting memorial to his name.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on flood control and incorporate therein a letter written by a friend of mine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have written and spoken on the Mississippi River and the problem its flood waters has brought to the people of the valley, I suppose, as often as any other citizen in or out of public life. I have been the congressional spokesman for several flood-control organizations ever since I came to Congress more than 10 years ago. I thought I knew the subject. I thought I felt the influence of the mighty river only as one born and reared on its banks in the lower reaches. I was certain I knew its story by heart—that I felt the song as it came from all the tributaries from the Alleghenies to the Rockies—from many an "ancient river, from many a palmy plain."

For more than a half of a century I have been "crossing the river," as we call it in New Orleans, and recrossing it. I have jumped across it at the first bridge far away in Lake Itasca. I have swam across it at New Orleans. I know that every drop of rain and every drop and flake of snow, or hail, or sleet that falls between the ramparts of the lordly range of the West and the inspiring crest of the mountains of the Atlantic coast must find its way to the Gulf by the portals of the last city on the Mississippi, except in flood times when the raging waters crash through the Atchafalaya and reach the eternal sea by that shorter route. I suppose I have as much of a recollection as most people in my section of the historic crevasses on both sides between Baton Rouge and New Orleans. Great crevasses are to many people inspiring and terrifying spectacles. The losses of property and life, the suffering and the destruction of homes are saddening to those whose efforts, thrift, and toil have built up the alluvial civilization.

Why do they live there, you ask, at danger's door? Ask the men and women whose ancestors from time immemorial wandered back to the slope of Vesuvius, Aetna, and the giant peaks of Himalayas, after volcanic eruptions had driven them from homes that were obliterated. Ask those that still dwell upon the banks of the Nile, the Tigris, and Euphrates, why they cling to their homes in the face of every disaster and vicissitude of nature, and they will say it was because their fathers knew the same calamities—and it is not as strange as it may appear at first blush, that those that were born and reared behind the levees never know, certainly never betray the same fear and trepidation as is exhibited by the stranger within our gates, and even by those that have been with us for 10, and in some cases, 15 years. Of course, we recognize the devastating effects of floods, and we are looking to the coming of the Mississippi Messiah—and I use that sacred word in the utmost reverence.

It is clear to my mind that if the valley had, as it some day will have, 150,000,000 souls or inhabitants that no one would dream of suffering under the flood-control plan that is, in effect, legally if not in practical operation. We endure it because we have neither the political power nationally, as a result of a lack of population, to secure something better, such as would protect us against the flood waters, which should be stored and reservoirized and conserved and made to render beneficial effects. Year-around navigation for the whole waterway system lying between the two mountain ranges of the country, power development lighting a thousand cities, driving the wheels of 10,000 factories, and illuminating millions of homes is not the dream of a dreamer or soothsayer or the song of a poet, but the well-considered plan of the leading engineers of the United States, who say that such a prospect is entirely feasible. It will come. Even the desert will blossom as the rose, and

man, who has conquered many problems, will put this and all other things under his feet.

It will come as the result of correct thinking, for it is on the anvil of discussion that the spark of truth will fly. And for the purpose of igniting the subject anew, of causing the spark to fly upward until it shall become a conflagration of force, I am going to give you the benefit of a view so daringly advanced, so intriguingly pictured, that if the writer had never done anything else he would have won the affections of those that admire literary skill and the ability to convey to the written pages the wonders that are yet to come. Mr. O'Donnell's paper, sent to me by himself, should be read by everyone interested in the great valley—by every American who believes in the growth of his country along lines that will insure its prosperity as a result of superior economic advantages, natural and man made. For even if you disagree with him, as I am obliged to do presently in regard to temporarily suspending the activity, the growth, and the importance of New Orleans, you will find food for thought in his marvelous paper. Perhaps many will dismiss him as an idle dreamer of dreams, but I am glad to submit his dream, for, after all, it is the dreamers of dreams, the music makers, who build up the world's great cities with their wonderful ditties and see with prophetic eye the glories of the coming day, for to them each age is a dream that is dying or one that is coming to birth.

THE GREAT MISSISSIPPI HIGHWAY

(A threefold transportation artery, water, rail, and automobile. One thousand two hundred miles of winding channel, hazardous to navigation, reduced to 600 miles of direct, safe, rapid transportation, connecting the heart of the continent with the ports of the world, would permanently eliminate the flood problem. An urgent necessity and a highly profitable investment. Patching of the Mississippi River false economy. The new highway would not disturb the present stream.)

THE DELTA

Geologists tell us that up until about 45,000 years ago the Gulf of Mexico extended about 600 miles farther north than the present Gulf coast line; in other words, to a point above the present junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers at Cairo, Ill. The sediment carried down by these and other streams has since filled this long bay or arm of the Gulf and produced the land now known as the Mississippi Delta. The width of this Delta, for the greater part, is about 40 miles; spreading out to about 150 miles at the coast line.

Ellett (pp. 25-26) says of this territory: "The Mississippi bears along at all times, but especially in the periods of floods, a vast amount of earthly matter suspended in its waters, which the current is able to carry forward so long as the river is confined to its channel; but when the water overflows its banks its velocity is checked and it immediately deposits the heaviest particles it transports and leaves them upon its borders. The consequence is that the borders of the river, which received the first and heaviest deposits, are raised higher above the general level of the plane than the soil which is more remote; and that while the plane of the Delta dips toward the sea at the rate of 8 inches per mile, the soil adjacent to the banks slopes off at right angles to the course of the river into the interior for 5 or 6 miles at the rate of 3 or 4 feet per mile."

"In times of flood the surface of the Mississippi is 18 or 20 feet higher than the level of a great part of the actual Delta and at low water its surface is found at the very lowest depression of the Delta, so that all the lateral streams and adjacent low grounds have a natural drainage toward its channel."

"The lands immediately on the borders of the river are extremely fertile and often highly cultivated; but as they are all subject to inundation during the high floods of the river, they are guarded by artificial embankments. The water presses upon these embankments and often produces breaches through them and rushes in a deep column into the low grounds from which it had been excluded by the levees and sweeps over any improvements that may have obtained a foothold there."

"The immediate borders of each tributary likewise exhibit deposits made by the tributary, highest at the edge of the channel and sloping off laterally to the adjacent lowlands, presenting a narrow strip of cultivated or arable soil near the winding channel and great, unbroken swamps beyond."

The Mississippi River flows through the flat territory of the Delta in a meandering course, covering a distance of about 1,200 miles, with an average fall of about $3\frac{1}{4}$ inches to the mile. It is probably the most crooked river in the world, and is continually changing its course, in spite of man's best efforts to control it. The average width of the river is about 3,300 feet. The maximum discharge of the river is about 2,000,000 cubic feet per second; the velocity 5 feet per second; the breast 215,000 square feet. The maximum rise above low water at Cairo is about 55 feet, and at New Orleans 24 feet.

FLOODS

Periodically, the Mississippi River overflows its banks and inundates, at times, approximately 20,000,000 acres of land. The great flood of 1927 was the most disastrous in many years, and the destruction

wrought by it has caused a widespread demand for better protection of the territory. The United States Government engineers have requested an appropriation of approximately \$500,000,000 with which to build bigger and better levees, and to provide spillways. Past experiences have proven, conclusively, that such measures will not be effective. They are mere palliatives and would have to be perpetually applied. At best they could only provide partial relief. They would neither facilitate transportation nor make it safer. The spillways would continue to inundate vast tracts of valuable land. Lack of confidence in these measures would retard development of the country; distress and uncertainty would be perpetuated.

MAKESHIFT SUGGESTIONS

Numerous suggestions have been offered as solutions of the Mississippi flood problem, such as reforestation of the territory at the headwaters of the upper tributaries; impounding dams in the upper streams to hold back the waters at flood times; bigger and better levees along the banks of the lower Mississippi, supplemented by a number of outlets or spillways through these levees to permit some of the excess waters to leave the main channel of the river and find a more direct route to the Gulf.

Bigger and better levees and spillways have been recommended by the Government engineers. The experience of the past shows that these would be merely temporizing expedients; levees can not be relied upon to hold the flood waters in the Mississippi channel; the river is one continuous series of bends, and the swift current of the waters will eat under the embankments at these bends causing them to topple. Even where the levees are back considerable distance from the banks of the river, the prolonged pressure of the flood waters behind them will cause the water-soaked earth from which the levee is made to lose its stability and slump flat away. The proposed spillways would continue to inundate thousands of acres of valuable land, resulting in the same damage that has been heretofore caused by breaks in the levees.

To complete the project of bigger and better levees where needed would require the construction of nearly 1,200 miles of embankments on each side of the lower river. The cost of replacement would never end; the stream would still be crooked; the channel would still be uncertain and hazardous to navigation; the expense of dredging would go on continuously, and there would be no hope of return on the money spent. The lowlands would not be successfully drained, and there would be nothing to stimulate development of the territory nor to encourage progress.

Eminent engineers claim that inasmuch as the most disastrous floods in the lower Mississippi River are caused by melting snow and rain in the headwaters at a time when there are no leaves on the trees, that reforestation would have little effect upon the heights of the floods. Forest litter on the surface has some effect in retarding the flow until the rain and melting snow has formed into streams; after that, only dams will retard the flow.

It has been shown that if all of the available sites for impounding dams had been in use during the 1927 flood, and if the best possible judgment had been used in holding the waters back at that time all of these dams would have been filled and would have lessened the height of the flood in its early stages, but that this particular flood was prolonged by continuous rains in the central Mississippi Basin, so that the waters that might have been held back in the early stages and that might have been effective in lessening the height of the flood waters in a flood of short duration could not have had any beneficial effect on such a flood as that of 1927. It is further shown that while it would be an easy matter to ascertain after a flood has run its course just how much water should have been held back in the many impounding dams in the vast territory of the headwaters to produce the best results, it is a much more difficult matter to guess in advance what to do.

It is estimated that if all possible reforestation plans were put into effect and all available sites for impounding dams were made use of and the plans for bigger and better levees were carried to completion, the total cost would be \$1,630,000,000. Should this vast amount of money be spent the flood problem would still remain unsolved; there would be no return on the money spent; large sums would still have to be spent for replacement of levees, dredging of channels, maintenance of signals in the crooked and ever-changing channel of the lower Mississippi; little of the flooded lands could be reclaimed, and what should be the most productive territory in the country would remain a dismal swamp, and the Mississippi unsolved flood problem would continue to disgrace a proud and powerful Nation.

THE COMPLETE, PERMANENT, AND PROFITABLE REMEDY

The creation of a magnificent threefold highway, water, rail, and automobile, as hereinafter described, would completely and permanently eliminate the flood problem, permanently reclaim the 20,000,000 acres of rich land now subject to overflow, and provide an unequalled transportation artery that could be operated with the utmost economy. This highway would have numerous modern harbors along the route, with the most up-to-date facilities for the transfer of goods, and from it would radiate innumerable water and rail branches, reaching throughout the heart of the continent.

DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

This new highway would ignore entirely the fact of the existence of the present Mississippi River throughout the length of its troublesome

course. It would begin at a point near the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, with separate connection to each; these two branches would unite a short distance below the city of Cairo; from thence the highway would run in a direct route almost due south to the Gulf, a distance of 600 miles, as contrasted with 1,200 miles by the course of the Mississippi River. It would consist of a pair of embankments, or improved type of levees, running parallel with each other and 1 mile apart. The distance would be 600 miles, whereas similar levees following the course of the river would require 1,200 miles on each side. The material used in the raising of these embankments would come from the inner side of each. The cuts thus made would create a pair of channels. Each channel would be 300 feet wide and 30 feet deep. The top of each embankment would be 60 feet above the bottom of the channel. On the channel side of each embankment a strong, reinforced concrete wall would be erected. An extension of this reinforced concrete would be spread over the bottom of the channel for the full width of 300 feet and would rise with a slope part way up the other side of the channel. The top of each embankment would be leveled off for a width of 200 feet and covered with a thick coat of reinforced concrete attached to and made a part of the wall near its top, thus providing an automobile highway 200 feet wide and 600 miles long, perfectly straight and practically water level. On a slightly lower elevation of each embankment a level roadway 100 feet wide would be provided for railroad tracks. These railroad lines would parallel the automobile highway on the outer side. The tracks would be electrified and would be supplied with current from Muscle Shoals and other hydroelectric power plants. These tracks being free from grades, transportation costs would be exceedingly small.

All other railroads making contact with these main lines would be privileged to use these tracks, at very small cost, to transport their goods to destination or to other roads. The railroads would all benefit by this arrangement; they would also benefit by being freed from flood damage. The railroads should be as much interested as the farmers in keeping the floods away. Their flood losses in the past have been very great.

Adjoining these railroad lines, on the outside, provision would be made for a local highway 40 feet wide. These local roads would connect with the main highways by means of tubes that would run under the railway lines and emerge onto the main highways with the slow-going traffic in such a manner as to make accidents practically impossible. The roads and highways on either side of the channels would be identical, but in reverse positions.

The space from wall to wall, constituting the big waterway, would have a width of 4,600 feet, and a depth in the channels of 60 feet; the depth between the channels would be 30 feet. This would be ample to take care of the largest possible flood. To give assurance that this statement is reasonable, it might be well to repeat that the present Mississippi River, from Cairo to the Gulf, has an average width of 3,300 feet and a fall of $3\frac{1}{4}$ inches to the mile, while the new channel would be 4,600 feet wide and would have a fall of more than 7 inches to the mile. The new channel would be capable of carrying in a given time more than twice as much water as the present river channel; and inasmuch as the present Mississippi River channel would still remain in use and still be capable of carrying as much water as it is at the present time, it can readily be seen that the two channels together would be able to take care of a flood three times as large as the great flood of 1927. Should a greater capacity in the new channel be thought advisable, it would only be necessary to increase the distance between the embankments; the cost of construction would not be increased; a little more land would be required.

CONSTRUCTION

Construction should begin at two separate points on the gulf coast. These points would be about 30 miles apart, in an east and west direction. From these two points two separate highways, of the type above described, would extend northwardly and parallel with each other for a distance of about 20 miles, then curve toward each other, and by a reverse curve merge into one. At the coast line, midway between these two highways, an artificial bay and safe harbor would be constructed. A double chain of islands, alternating in position, forming a semicircle, would provide a breakwater to protect the harbor. Each island would be oval in shape, $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles long and one-half mile wide. These islands would be encased in concrete, and would be high enough to resist tidal waves. Fortifications would be placed on these islands; some of them could also be used as recreation centers and for public institutions. The shore line opposite these islands would also be semicircular in form; the bay between would be an oval, 10 miles long and 5 miles wide, from the island to the harbor line, at the widest point.

From the outer edges of this bay two channels, similar in construction to the main highways, would extend northwardly and parallel with each other and 10 miles apart, for a distance of about 10 miles, from which points they would curve toward each other until they met. From this meeting point a single channel, of similar construction, would extend northwardly for a distance of about 10 miles where it would again split, and its two branches, by lines curving outwardly, would extend to and connect with the two separate branches of the main highway. At these points of connection locks would be installed,

to provide means of ingress and egress for boats, to and from the main channels and the inner channels, at all times, regardless of the height of the water in the main channels. The combined docking frontage on the harbor and both sides of the inner channels would be nearly 100 miles. The most improved docking facilities that modern engineering skill can provide should be installed, both in the harbor and along the banks of the inner channels. Inasmuch as there exist no natural barriers, and there would be no previous mistakes to be corrected, and no valuable property to be damaged, there could be no excuse for not making this the greatest and most perfect harbor in the world.

The purpose of splitting the main channel at a point 35 miles north of the Gulf coast is to prevent the sediment, amounting to approximately 200,000,000 cubic yards per annum, that is carried down by the river from filling up the harbor and also to keep the water in the inner channel at a permanent level, affected only by tides, which at this point on the coast are only 14 inches.

Continuing the work of construction northwardly from the intersection of the two main channels, 35 miles north of the coast line, when a small stream from the west is encountered, a culvert would be provided under the westerly embankment, at a point a short distance below where the main highway would cut such stream. After the construction of the main highway has proceeded beyond the culvert a sufficient distance to be clear of its effects the water of this tributary would be turned into the new main channel. When larger tributaries are reached an open channel, of construction similar to that of the main highway, would be provided, also at a safe distance below where the new main channel would cut the tributary, and after the work of construction of the new channel had progressed beyond this point the tributary would be turned into the main channel. In this manner most of the construction work could be done in dry earth. The roads on the westerly side of the highway would be carried over the larger tributaries by bridges. This process would be continued northwardly to a point a short distance below Cairo, where the main highway and channels would again split; one fork would connect with the Ohio at Cairo, and the other would connect with the Mississippi River a short distance above Cairo. Only the tributaries from the west would be connected with the new channel; all of the tributaries from the east now entering the Mississippi River would remain undisturbed.

The waters of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers having thus been turned in between these two concrete-bound embankments, would flow directly south to the Gulf, over a course less than half the length of the present Mississippi River between the same points.

Below Cairo a dam and locks would be provided to form a connection of the new channel with the lower Mississippi for the double purpose of regulating the flow of water into the Mississippi in dry seasons so as to provide a navigable depth, and to make it possible for boats to pass from one river to the other at all times, regardless of the height of the water on either side.

OTHER LOCKS AND DAMS

The low-water elevation at Cairo being 275 feet higher than the waters of the Gulf, other locks and dams, about 30 in number, should be provided in the new channel. These dams should be movable, and their height automatically regulated by the height of the water in the river; as the water rises the dams would drop down, so that in moderately high water and in times of flood boats could pass over these dams on the down trip without the delay of going through the locks. Numerous advantages are to be found in having a number of low dams rather than a few high ones; the territory being exceedingly flat, the lower the dam the less contrast between the elevation of the water in the river and the land adjacent, particularly at the dam; the cuts and fills would be less; the water would flow with a more uniform velocity; two pairs of crossover traffic tubes would be provided under each dam, one pair for railroads and the other pair for general traffic; the more numerous the dams the less distance between crossings.

It would also be advisable, wherever possible, to place these dams just above the larger tributaries that are now subject to overflow; lowering the channel would increase the velocity in the tributary and prevent overflow.

At each dam, and for a distance of several hundred feet above and below, the side channel depth, together with the concrete covering of its bottom, would extend from wall to wall; this would permit boats to cross from one channel to another and would form a wide and continuous slab of reinforced concrete which would protect the dam from the possibility of being damaged by the swift current of the water in times of flood.

RIVER HARBORS

Provision would be made for numerous harbors along both walls of the new river at such points as, in the opinion of experts, towns and cities would be likely to spring up. These harbors would be provided with elevators, varying in size, to meet every requirement; these would be recessed into the concrete retaining walls.

These elevators would be large enough to take care of the transfer of any commodity that might be offered; they would meet the level of the deck of the boat, regardless of the elevation of the water in the river, and would also meet the level of the bed on any railroad car, truck, or other conveyance. All other necessary or desirable transfer facilities

could be afforded. This arrangement would be in striking contrast with the muddy, sloping, ever-changing wharves now to be seen along the banks of the Mississippi River, where the only transfer facilities to be found consist of an indifferent type of manual labor.

The principal excuse offered for not providing transfer facilities along the lower Mississippi has been that it could not be relied upon to stay in the same place, and that the excessive variation in the water level, an extreme variation of 55 feet at Cairo, made it impossible to provide any desirable or economic appliance that would be workable at all stages of the river. With the new channel completed, providing a reliable by-pass for all of the flood waters, the Mississippi channel would be more reliable; there would be little variation in the height of the water; there would be less erosion of the banks, less changing in the course of the river, less trouble from shifting bars, as all of these things are caused by the waters when in flood, and the floods would be a thing of the past. The river channel could with little difficulty be kept permanently in place, dredging costs would cease, the danger from snags would disappear, and navigation would be made easy and safe.

RIVER TRANSPORTATION

To become a successful carrier the river should offer a channel as sure and reliable as the roadbed of a first-class railroad. Not only would this new artery of commerce provide such a channel, but, unlike the present Mississippi River, the channel would be straight for its entire length. This would be an agreeable contrast with the present lower Mississippi, which is admitted to be the most crooked and uncertain river in the world. Not only is the present river lengthened by its continuous bends, but the constant changing of the channel, shifting of bars, constant danger of striking unseen snags, make navigation slow, difficult, and hazardous. The new channel would be straight, permanent, free from hazards of every kind, and could be navigated with ease, speed, and safety at all times.

NO BARRIERS

There would be no difficult engineering problems to solve in connection with the construction of the new highway. With the exception of a narrow ridge at Helena, Ark., the territory traversed is practically flat. There would be little variation in the amount of excavation required; most of the work could be done on dry land; the work could be carried on simultaneously at many different points; if started promptly it would solve the problem of unemployment during the period of construction; and the new industries and developments that the transportation economies resulting from the new highway would induce throughout the vast territory served, would provide permanent employment and widespread prosperity for an indefinite period.

OCEAN VESSELS

This new waterway would permit all but the very largest ocean-going boats to reach the interior of the country; it would bring the ports of the world into the heart of the continent. An extension of this great waterway to St. Louis, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and the Great Lakes, connecting the two great internal waterway systems of the country with the ports of the world would not only be feasible but an attractive and profitable undertaking.

GENUINE AND PERMANENT FARM RELIEF

The savings in transportation cost on farm products and on the things that the farmer must buy, would bring permanent prosperity to those farmers in the Middle West who are now suffering. The cost of transporting the products of these farms to the seaboard for export would be so greatly reduced that these products could be sold at a profit throughout the world in the face of the keenest possible competition. This new economic highway would give us an advantage in the great and growing markets of South America, and the countries across the Pacific.

VITAPORT—A CITY OF UNEQUALLED UTILITY AND INCOMPARABLE CHARM

On the Gulf coast, between the two branches of the main channel, a territory comprising about 800 square miles, every facility would be offered for the creation of a magnificent city; a city with ample parks and wide thoroughfares; a city free from slums and without congestion; a city equipped with every facility for the proper handling of the commerce of the world; a city that would be the pride of modern civilization; an ideal city in the truest sense. The best engineering skill from every country in the world should be invited to cooperate in the development of this great city; it should become the masterpiece of the ages; a place in which life would be well worth living; the nearest possible approach to the Garden of Eden. In the creation of this beautiful city and magnificent harbor no hampering conditions would be found; no engineering difficulties would be encountered; no valuable land would be damaged; no costly improvements would have to be destroyed. The engineers and artists would be free to follow their inspirations to their highest points of perfection. This city should eventually become not only the greatest port in the country, but in the entire world; it could be kept perpetually free from the possibility of a railroad monopoly, as the great system of railroad lines provided for in the beginning, and extending from the port up through the heart of the country could be used without discrimination by all roads making contact with it at any point on a fair and impartial basis.

The cost of this project would be large, but unlike the profitless patchwork policy now in effect, and which it is proposed by some to

perpetuate, it would produce immense returns on the investment, and be an everlasting monument to those responsible for its construction.

THE TERRITORY TO BE SERVED

John L. Matthews (pp. 1, 2, 3) says: "The map of North America presents no more striking feature than the system of waterways which flow into, or are allied with, the Mississippi River. The land which they drain is the fertile heart of the continent. It includes the greatest wealth of the United States and Canada. In the South, the sugar and rice of the Gulf States and the greatest cotton fields in the world; north of them, the home of American corn; and still north of this the great wheat-growing region, which we shall never see equalled. It is by no figure of speech that I have called this the heart of the continent, for it is the source and center of our circulation; the fount whence springs our lifeblood; the never-ceasing engine.

"It is therefore by a specially bountiful provision of nature that in and from this heart lead the most wonderful arteries for a national life which are provided for any people."

"A parallel to that which the nations have striven for a century to construct, a continental system of internal waterways, America has here already at hand, and so situated that on its banks must be produced and consumed the greater part of all that the Nation produces from fields or factories or buys from other peoples.

"When the settlement of this new center began these rivers formed the natural channels by which people flocked in and by which their cargoes were handled. Later these people gave over the use of their steamboats to develop the faster and more certain railways. To-day these railways are congested and outgrown, and for bulk freights, at least, we are being driven back to the waterways. And when the center is entirely populated no thousands of miles of railways that can be built there, whether operated by steam or electricity, by coal, or by sunlight, will be capable of serving its trade."

Edwin J. Clapp (p. 118) says: "The Mississippi is the American Rhine, Weser, Elbe, and Oder all combined. It furnishes the best American comparison with the Rhine, and perhaps an occasion of applying the lessons in waterway transportation which the Rhine has to teach. Both Rhine and Mississippi flow through the heart of a rich continent; each represents nature's route of communication between its own fertile valley and the outside world. In their history the streams present a striking parallel up to the period of 1860-1870; then transportation on the Rhine is modernized and the river takes its place as the greatest waterway in the world, while the Mississippi retains its ancient form of transportation and goes down under the competition of American railroads."

RHINE VERSUS MISSISSIPPI

In 1907 traffic on the Rhine, which was improved for a length of 350 miles, carried over 64,000,000 tons; the increase from 1885 being over 400 per cent. In 1906 traffic on the Mississippi, with 16,000 miles of channel capable of development to a navigable depth, carried only 19,000,000 tons; the principal cause of this difference being that the Rhine was improved while the Mississippi was not.

MONONGAHELA RIVER

Following the improvement of the Monongahela River by the United States Government, at a cost of \$15,000,000, traffic on this river reached 25,000,000 tons per annum, at a saving to shippers of over \$25,000,000 per annum; the saving in any one year being much more than the entire cost of the improvement. The traffic and earnings of the railroads which follow either bank of the Monongahela River have increased in proportion to the increase in river traffic. The railroads have not lost, but their gains have been immense.

VAST TERRITORY

The Mississippi Basin drains 785,000,000 acres of the most productive land in the world. Had the best engineering talent of the ages cooperated in designing the central river and Great Lakes waterways system, nature's work could not have been improved upon. The natural direction of traffic through this immensely productive territory is and should be north and south. The products of this district can be transported to the ports of the world and exchanged for the products of the world by this natural route at much less cost than by the unnatural routes east and west over high mountain ranges that are now in use.

CAN THE NATION AFFORD THIS GREAT IMPROVEMENT?

It would seem more appropriate to ask, Can the Nation afford to be any longer without it? Is the country able to invest the amount of money that would be required? A good answer to these questions would be an exhibit of the things that this country has shown that it can afford. The following are a few of them:

The great Mississippi flood of 1927 is said to have cost approximately \$1,000,000,000; every dollar of this is lost forever. The World War, at the time of signing of the armistice, was costing our Government \$70,000,000 per day. Had the war lasted another 60 days the additional cost would have been \$4,200,000,000, or more than the amount necessary to provide for this great improvement. The net war cost was about \$18,000,000,000, to say nothing of the value of the lives lost, and for all of this no return was expected. According to Judge Lindley, of Chicago, crime is costing this country \$13,000,000,000 annually, and for

this we get no return. Our present national income is said to be \$90,000,000,000.

The people of this country have loaned or invested in foreign countries during 1927 alone more than \$2,000,000,000; our total investments since the war in foreign countries and at present outstanding is in excess of \$14,000,000,000. This is exclusive of war loans made by our Government, which is at present in excess of \$11,000,000,000. These outstanding loans of Government and people, amounting in all to over \$25,000,000,000, represent the surplus that this country has found it possible to invest abroad in the past few years. Our own national debt is being reduced at the rate of about \$1,000,000,000 per year, and we are accumulating a surplus of about \$500,000,000 per year. Although our Nation is striving for universal peace, there is talk of entering upon a naval program that would require more than \$1,000,000,000. The wealth that we waste annually has been estimated at several billions of dollars.

PATCHWORK A FUTILE WASTE

Should the proposed patchwork plans be carried out in the lower Mississippi River the cost of maintenance and replacements would be enormous and perpetual. The present cost of dredging of the bars alone is \$600,000 per year. These expenses, in the aggregate, would exceed the requirements for interest and sinking funds on a bond issue of sufficient amount to build the great, serviceable, and permanent highway herein outlined. With the new highway in operation, the cost of maintenance of the old channel would be reduced to the minimum. When, through the savings in the cost of maintenance of the old channel the bonds for the cost of the new channel were retired, this outlay for interest and sinking fund would cease, but if the proposed patchwork policy is persisted in the expense will never end, and we will have none of the benefits that the new highway would produce.

SAVINGS AND BENEFITS

The construction of the direct, threefold transportation artery would permanently solve the Mississippi flood problem; it would save many millions of dollars annually in transportation costs; it would completely and permanently drain and protect from overflow 20,000,000 acres of rich land in one of the most attractive sections of the country; the enhancement in the value of this land alone would exceed the entire cost of the great improvement project. The time would come when the value of the crops from this land in a single year would exceed the cost of the improvement. The unparalleled transportation facilities that would be afforded by this great highway and its connecting lines and tributaries would cause the great basin to swarm with industries, transforming the various accessible raw materials into finished products. The richness of the soil and the attractiveness of the climate should make this section the garden spot of the earth.

IMPORTANT TERRITORY

The waters of the Mississippi flow from 33 of the 48 States of the Union. The Mississippi Basin drains over 40 per cent of the territory of the United States. This territory produces approximately 80 per cent of the minerals, agricultural, and manufactured articles of the country; it sends to Congress 63 per cent of its Members. These Representatives can perform no greater service to their constituents and to the country as a whole than to promote the construction and early completion of this most essential project.

POPULATION

The density of population in the United States is less than 40 to the square mile; that of Germany nearly 300; and that of Belgium more than 600. The construction of the great Mississippi highway should have such a beneficial effect upon the Delta territory that it would attract, and sustain comfortably, a population more dense and more prosperous than that of Belgium—in other words, 50,000,000 people.

EFFECT UPON RAILROADS

The millions of dollars that would be saved in transporting products over this improved system of highways might at first glance appear to be at the expense of the present east and west transportation lines. This, however, would not be the case. Time would be required to bring about the change and the great stimulus to prosperity that the undertaking would provide, added to the normal progress of the country during the interval, would find the present railway systems overtaxed more than before.

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

The export and import business now done at New Orleans might be partially diverted to the new port created at the mouth of the new channel, but this would not be an uncompensated loss to New Orleans. On the contrary, the new prosperity that would become general throughout the great Middle West, and particularly in the Delta district, would overwhelm the city of New Orleans.

New York City might lose some part of the export and import business now being done with the interior of the country, but New York, the great financial center of the world, would be called upon to finance the numerous enterprises that would spring up in the Mississippi Basin, and these would pour their tribute in an ever-increasing golden stream into New York. The increased prosperity of the banks in the central territory would necessitate an increase in their cash reserves in the New York banks. Prosperity would become contagious throughout the

country; as an economic loss is borne by all, so also an economic gain is shared by all. The economic advantages resulting from the creation of this great highway would exceed anything that this country has ever experienced, and would be felt throughout the Nation. This new highway would create a social, commercial, industrial, and political bond of immeasurable value, both in time of peace and in time of war. Its effects in lessening the cost of transportation on exports and imports would be equivalent to the removal of a high export and import tariff. The benefits to the whole country would be incalculable.

SHARING THE COST

Representatives from the flooded territory have protested against being assessed for any part of the cost of the flood-protection measures proposed by the Government engineers. They may be justified in this stand. But if genuine relief could be had, such as would result from the measures herein proposed, the owners of the land benefited could well afford to pay a fair share of the cost through a separate tax.

ENHANCEMENT

There are 20,000,000 acres of flooded land, of an average present value of less than \$20 per acre. The enhancement in the value of this land, being exceedingly rich, but handicapped by constant danger from floods, should be at least \$100 per acre, or \$2,000,000,000. There are 100,000,000 acres of land adjacent that will not develop under present conditions; these should enhance in value \$50 per acre, or \$5,000,000,000. Vitaport, the marvelous new city, would beneficially affect 500,000 acres to the extent of \$100,000 per acre in the business district, down to \$1,000 per acre at the outer boundaries, an average of over \$50,000 per acre, or \$25,000,000,000. Other cities and towns that would spring up along the route of the highway would beneficially affect 100,000 acres to the extent of \$10,000 per acre, or \$1,000,000,000. The value of the new industries that this great improvement would induce should exceed \$10,000,000,000. The increase in value of agricultural products and minerals should run into thousands of millions of dollars.

RECAPITULATION

20,000,000 acres of flooded land, enhanced.....	\$2,000,000,000
100,000,000 acres adjacent land, enhanced.....	5,000,000,000
500,000 acres in the city of Vitaport, enhanced.....	25,000,000,000
100,000 acres in other cities along the route, enhanced.....	1,000,000,000
New industries.....	10,000,000,000
Grand total.....	43,000,000,000

CREDIT

Only the credit of the Government would be needed. The burden on the taxpayers would not be increased. The money wasted in futile patchwork of the lower Mississippi River would be saved and would pay the interest and sinking funds on the bond issue required for the project. The interest on the bonds need not be more than 3½ per cent.

The saving in flood losses, plus the saving in transportation costs, plus the enhancement in the value of land, together with the benefits of the new prosperity that would be sure to result from the improvement, would make the tax burden easier for all.

A careful study of the merits of this great project should convince the most skeptical that it would not be in nature of an expense, but rather a highly profitable investment and an urgent necessity.

JOHN H. O'DONNELL.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CLARKE of New York, indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 420. An act for the relief of Charles E. Byron, alias Charles E. Marble;

S. 969. An act for the relief of Edna B. Erskine;

S. 1447. An act for the relief of Pasquale Iannacone;

S. 1469. An act to quitclaim certain lands in Santa Fe County, N. Mex.;

S. 2371. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional justices of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia;

S. 3784. An act for the relief of John Marks, alias John Bell;

S. 3866. An act for the relief of Joseph N. Marin;

S. 3939. An act to authorize the appointment of two additional justices of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia;

S. 4050. An act to confer full rights of citizenship upon the Cherokee Indians resident in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes;

S. 4140. An act providing for the sale of the remainder of the coal and asphalt deposits in the segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

S. 4583. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River opposite to or within the corporate limits of Nebraska City, Nebr.," approved June 4, 1872; and

S. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on the public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to William Jennings Bryan.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2667. An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11679. An act to provide for acquiring and disposition of certain properties for use or formerly used by the Lighthouse Service; and

H. R. 12348. An act to provide for the partial payment of the expenses of foreign delegates to the eleventh annual convention of the Federation Interalliee Des Anciens Combattants, to be held in the District of Columbia in September, 1930.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 17, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Tuesday, June 17, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for the prohibition upon the importation into the United States of certain anthracite coal (H. R. 12061).

To amend paragraph 922 of this tariff act of 1930 (H. J. Res. 370).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

For the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-share reserves (H. R. 7934).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

551. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1931, amounting to \$5,500, for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (H. Doc. No. 474); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

552. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of proposed provision pertaining to an existing authorization of the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 475); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 71. A bill amending so much of the sundry civil act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. p. 730), as relates to disposition of moneys belonging to the deceased inmates of St. Elizabeths Hospital; with amendment (Rept. No. 1933). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 2231. An act to reserve certain lands on the public domain in Arizona for the use and benefit of the Papago Indians, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1934). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KNUTSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 4051. An act authorizing the Pillager Bands of Chippewa Indians, residing in the State of Minnesota, to submit claims to the Court of Claims; with amendment (Rept. No. 1935). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANSLEY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 12923. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4799. A bill for the relief of James Johnson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2697. A bill for the relief of Franz J. Jonitz, first lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 1929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4242. A bill for the relief of Fred W. Boschen, lieutenant colonel, Finance Department, United States Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 1930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6763. A bill for the relief of Albert G. Dawson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1931). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8848. A bill for the relief of Daniel W. Seal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1932). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KNUTSON: Committee on Pensions. H. R. 12586. A bill granting an increase of pension to Josefa T. Phillips; with amendment (Rept. No. 1936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6772. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Wilder; with amendment (Rept. No. 1937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHALMERS: A bill (H. R. 12990) authorizing the construction of a breakwater and retaining wall in Maumee Bay, Ohio, for the protection of life and property for extreme high water and storms; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H. R. 12991) to authorize the creation of game refuges on the Ouachita National Forest in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUAYLE: A bill (H. R. 12992) to amend the act of March 4, 1911, ch. 239, 36 Stat. L. 1267, as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12993) granting the consent to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Little Calumet River on One hundred and fifty-ninth Street, in Cook County, State of Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12994) to authorize the creation of organized rural communities to demonstrate methods of reclamation and benefits of planned rural development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12995) to provide that the United States shall cooperate with the States in promoting the general health of the rural population of the United States, and the welfare and hygiene of mothers and children; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANSLEY: A bill (H. R. 12996) to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: Resolution (H. Res. 257) for the consideration of House bill 10560, entitled "A bill to amend section 22 of the Federal reserve act"; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 370) to amend paragraph 922 of the tariff act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 371) limiting importation packages of cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER of California: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 372) authorizing the President of the United States to accept on behalf of the United States a conveyance of certain lands on Government Island from the city of Alameda, Calif., in consideration of the relinquishment by the United States of all its rights and interest under a lease of such island dated July 5, 1918; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 12997) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Bird, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 12998) for the relief of John Donahue; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COYLE: A bill (H. R. 12999) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Showalter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13000) granting an increase of pension to Ann F. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13001) granting a pension to Mary E. Beggs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAWL: A bill (H. R. 13002) granting a pension to Mary A. Lockie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 13003) granting a pension to Lucy May Call; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 13004) granting a pension to James D. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 13005) granting a pension to David Franklin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 13006) granting a pension to John McKinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13007) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LETTS: A bill (H. R. 13008) for the relief of Frank C. Young; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13009) granting a pension to Martha E. Drenner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 13010) for the relief of George Fling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 13011) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13012) granting a pension to Margaret Singleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 13013) granting a pension to Clarence H. Cress; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 13014) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7575. Petition of Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor, requesting that the eighteenth amendment be submitted to the State legislatures for ratification or rejection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7576. Petition of American Legion, National Headquarters, Indianapolis, Ind., opposed to the establishment of a municipal and Federal airport adjoining the Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7577. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution adopted by the Crawford Business Men's League, of Chicago, Ill., urging Congress and National Government to pass legislation which will check the extension of monopolies known as the chain-store system, and to protect the individual business man from domination and destruction of monopolistic and predatory business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7578. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Victor A. Olander, secretary Illinois State Federation of Labor, Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 6603; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7579. Also, petition of Margaret Devlin Dunn, 201 East Randolph Avenue, Alexandria, Va., urging the passage of House bill 6603, providing half holiday for certain Government employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7580. Also, petition of Charles D. Morton, vice president, Morton Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill., protesting the passage of House bill 11096; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7581. Also, petition of Paul B. David, secretary-treasurer Building Service Employees' Union, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the adoption of House bill 6603; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7582. Also, petition of Mrs. E. H. Cox, 635 Fonti Street, La Salle, Ill., urging the support of House bill 9986 and Senate bill 1003; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7583. Also, petition of H. H. Cust, vice president, Mount Vernon Car Manufacturing Co., Mount Vernon, Ill., protesting the passage of House bill 9232; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

TUESDAY, June 17, 1930

The Rev. James W. Morris, D. D., assistant rector Church of the Epiphany, city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Lord of all power and might, author and giver of all good things, without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy, grant unto us, Thy servants, by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit to love the things which Thou commandest and desire that which Thou dost promise, that having a right judgment in all things we may always please Thee in will and deed. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. JOHNSON and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1372) authorizing an appropriation for payment of claims of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians.

The message also announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 3421. An act to authorize the Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choptank River at a point at or near Cambridge, Md.;

S. 3970. An act authorizing the Smithsonian Institution to extend the Natural History Building and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; and

S. 4283. An act ratifying and confirming the title of the State of Minnesota and its grantees to certain lands patented to it by the United States of America.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 3258. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the Postmaster General to accept the bid of the Mississippi Shipping Co. to carry mail between United States Gulf ports and the east coast of South America.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2414) authorizing the Government of the United States to participate in the international hygiene exhibition at Dresden, Germany, from May 6, 1930, to October 1, 1930, inclusive, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3309. An act to provide extra compensation for overtime service performed by immigrant inspectors and other employees of the Immigration Service;

H. R. 8583. An act for the relief of the State of Maine and the city of Portsmouth, N. H.;

H. R. 9090. An act for the rehabilitation of the Bitter Root irrigation project, Montana;

H. R. 10376. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Kansas City, Kans.;

H. R. 12099. An act to apply the pension laws to the Coast Guard;

H. R. 12121. An act to provide for a survey of the Salmon River, Alaska, with a view to the prevention and control of its floods;

H. R. 12284. An act to provide for the construction of vessels for the Coast Guard for rescue and assistance work on Lake Erie;

H. R. 12343. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept donations of sites for public buildings;

H. R. 12586. An act granting an increase of pension to Josefa T. Phillips;

H. R. 12842. An act to create an additional judge for the southern district of Florida;

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes; and